

B. Andrews's Of Episcopacy. II. Episcopacy in a long sense descended; which commandeth Actions, for having to oppose himself against the Consent and Practice of the Catholic Church; which all Churches have

S. Ignatius in Epistola ad Magnelianos.

Ὁ Ἰσχυρὸς Κύριος ἐγώ, οὗ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐξ ὅτι ποιεῖ, καὶ τοῦ καὶ υμῖν ἀνεῖ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, μὲν Γρηγο-
ρίῳ πρεβυτέρῳ, μὲν Διδάκτορος, μὲν Λαϊκῶν. ΜΑΓΝΗ ΠΡΟΒΕΛΩΤΗ ὑμῶν, ἰσοδύνατος παρὰ πᾶσι ἐκείνῃ γινώ-
μιμα. Τὸ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ ἐχθροῦ.

As our Lord doth nothing without his Father ;
so neither do ye without the Bishop ; neither Pres-
byter , Deacon , nor Layman . Let nothing seem rea-
sonable to you , against his liking : For whatsoever
is so , is against the Law , and offensive to God .



B. Andrews's Of Episcopacy. II. Episcopacy in a long sense descended; which commandeth Actions, for having to oppose himself against the Consent and Practice of the Catholic Church; which all Churches have

Ὁ Ἰουάνης ὁ Κλέριος, ἐν τῇ Πατρὶς ἐδὲ ἐν πολεῖ, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνέβη τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τῷ
 Βυπρῳ, καὶ τῷ Διέκοντῳ, καὶ τῷ Λαϊκῷ. Ἡ δὲ πρῶτη ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς
 ἡμῶν. Τὸ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἑκτοντος.

As our Lord doth nothing without his Father ;
so neither do ye without the Bishop ; neither Pres-
byter , Deacon , nor Layman . Let nothing seem rea-
sonable to you , against his liking : For whatsoever
is so , is against the Law , and offensive to God .



(67)
A
REPLY

TO

D^R. MORTONS

PARTICVLAR DEFENCE
OF THREE NOCENT
CEREMONIES.

Viz.

The Surplice, Crosse in Baptisme, and kneeling at
the receiving of the sacramentall elements
of Bread and Wine.

[By William Ames]



Printed in the year 1623.

manuscript

Sheweth the grounds whereon the same are proved

Dy'd - 1659. Dr. Thomas Norton, a worthy Prelate, ~~was~~
Bp. of Durham, ^{He} was Educated in St. Johns College in
University of Cambridge; a learned, pious, & venerable
person; who happily employ'd his pen, both ag^t
superstition & faction; & held great correspondence
with eminent Foreigners of different persuasions. After
he ^{had} gone through many preferment, & undergone many
changes & Alterations, He Dy'd, very Old, & was buried at Newcastle
of an Hundred years. Richard's Hist. of Eng. p. 752. 3rd Ed. 1720.



To the Authour.

R Everend and beloved friend, I understand that your Reply to Dr. Mortons Generall Defence of those three nocent Ceremonies, hath given very good content to many judicious Ministers, and good people in our land: so that they greatly desire to see the like Reply to his Particular Defence: And because it is thought, that I know the Authour, I am earnestly intreated by letters that I would be a meanes to stirre him up to so good a worke. Wherfore I beseech you to hearken to my request, take the like paines (good Sir) about the Particulars. It may discourage you to thinke that this your Reply will occasion your further labour in answering to Dr. Mortons Answer to these two Replies: but if you consider the great strength of truth, there is no cause to fear this fear. You see how Dr. Downam is daunted by Mr. Gersom Bucerus, his modest Confutation of his Sermon at Lambeth, which he made in defence of the Lordly Prelacie in England, and in disgrace of the Eldership of the more, and better reformed Churches of Christ, in the Low Countries and in Scotland: (I mean in Scotland ere this most unhappy deformation of that most beautifull Spouse of Christ was brought in, by these late usurping Bishops; who be the more detestable, because of their former profession and subscription, from which they haue made a shamefull apostasie in the sight of other Reformed Churches: their sinne herein being the more heynous, because they goe back towards Popery in these backsliding times, and with hypocriticall Saul persecute their brethren, whose upright courses their own consciences approue. Miserable men they be (as long as they continue in their evill) to Whom our Saviour denounceth woe, because of the grievous offence which they giue.) And if Dr. Downam, who was counted an ingenious man, ere he was a Lord Bishop, be thus at a stand, that in these five yeares he hath not answered one word; why may wee

not thinke the like of Dr. Morton, when he shall see that hee also hath taken upon him the defence of a bad cause? I pray you be the more incouraged, by considering the writings of these two Doctors, ere they were Bishops, and since. Before they were solide Writers, abounding with manifest proofes out of Gods Word, while they dealt against the Papists: But now sharpening their pennes against the truth; how few quotations of Scriptures can you finde? What wresting of the Scriptures is evident in their later writings?

Besides, I hope you will be moved the rather to take this further paines; because I perceiue that many, both godly Ministers and people of our land, doe of late more take the good and holy cause of Reformation to heart then heretofore, and grow into a greater dislike of the unlawfull Prelacie and Ceremonies among us, then formerly: especially seeing the Bishops as silent, as so many dumb dogs, when Popery increaseth daily in the Land. Let therefore this fit opportunity stir up your heart the more to speak a word for the innocent and oppressed. Finally, let me say to you, with some alteration, as zealous Mordecai said to Esther, Who knoweth whether you be ordained of God for such a time? Assure your selfe many of Gods people will be strengthened by your labours, and so the more thanks shall be given, and the more prayers made to God for you. But why should I use reasons to perswade you to that, which your loue of, and zeale for the truth, cannot but constrain you to doe? Thus not doubting but I shall obtain this just and equall request, which I make in the behalfe of many that fear God, and long to see our Church disburthened of many hurtfull humane traditions, and governed by that holy Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in his holy and unchangeable word, I commend you and your labours to the rich blessing of God in Christ Iesus our onely Saviour:

Your loving friend, whom you
know by my hand.

A Re



A Reply to Doctor

MORTONS

PARTICVLAR DEFENCE OF THREE NOCENT CEREMONIES.

SI R, though I cannot but grudge the time which I spend in considering any farther of D. Mortons defence (having formerly in the generalls found it to be but painted paper) yet perceiving that in the particular defence there is very little of moment beside that which in the generall part hath formerly been confuted, I will not stand with you, being so earnest with me in your letter, about the exumining of the latter part also, after the same brieffe manner which gave you, and others, content in the former.

CAP. I. SECT. I.

THE first accusation (for though the generall arguments in the former part are vouchsafed the name of objections, yet the particular of the second part are perpetually stiled by the Defendant, I know not for what cause, accusations) the first accusation (I say) propounded by the Def: in the name of the Non-conformists, is thus set down: *In appointing any severall apparell unto ministers, there is some iniurie done unto them: for Bucer professeth, that in all the Churches where hee had been teacher, hee took order that no speciall apparell might be prescribed for the ministers to weare. Cartw. in the rest of his 2 Reply, p. 249. & Abridg. Lincoln p. 54.* In which words there is an assertion, and the reason of it, connected together by the particle *for*; so that no simple or credulous reader can otherwise think, but that Bucers fact is by M. Cartwright and the Abridgment made a reason of the Assertion, viz. that ministers have some iniurie done unto them in that severall apparell is appointed unto them. But whosoever will but looke upon the places quoted, shall see that both M. Cartwright, and the ministers of

Lincolne Diocesse, haue manifest iniurie done unto them by the Def. in fathering upon them a reason which is indeed of his own framing. Neither they nor any that ever writ against humane superstitions, let fall such a loole consequence: *It is iniurie to appoint any severall apparell unto ministers, because Bucer tooke order that none should be prescribed in those Churches where hee was teacher.* M. Cartwright indeed hath the Assertion that *some iniurie is done, &c.* but mentioneth not at all Bucers practise, much lesse maketh it a maine reason of his assertion. The authors of the Abridgement quote indeed the profession and practise of Bucer, but they make no mention at all of iniurie done to the ministers, so farre are they from making his practise a principall reason of that assertion. What came into the Def. his head when he patched these things together in this manner, I cannot tell: but this I am sure, to make our writers authors of such a mishapen reason, is no plain equall dealing.

Now in the defence which is made against this deformed accusation, something is sayd severally, 1. about M. Cartwright his assertion: and 2. about M. Bucer. I will gather all that is materiall unto certaine heads.

1 He telleth us, that *though Ministers ought to bee chiefly discerned by vertues, yet the difference of outward garments cannot but be held convenient, for the distinguishing of them from Laicks, in the discharge of their function, especially in the dayes of peace, and libertie, even by the rule of decencie.* Where 1. a man may thinke by his carefull discerning betwixt ministers vertues and garments, which he illustrateth also by a comparison of womens vertues and garments, that his mind in this answer was upon some other objection about vertues: for all that is nothing to the objection propounded. 2. He mistaketh his mark also when he avoucheth *difference of apparell to be convenient*; For the objection is appointing different apparell; now many things are convenient for men, which yet cannot be strictly appointed unto them without some iniurie; as for example, it is convenient (without all doubt) that Bishops, even Archbishops, should giue God thanks themselves in person, when they goe to meat: yet many of our Bishops I am sure (if not all) would think it an iniurie to haue this appointed unto them: for then they should not be so much honoured as now they are by Chaplains attending upon their table to ease them of that paines: and surely it were an iniurie to appoint such a thing unto godly ministers, even therefore because it is so convenient, that they would be loath to haue any suspicion of such a rude or else proud negligence cast upon them by a iunction. 3. The terme of *Laicks* by which hee doth

doth verbally distinguish other Christians from Ministers, sa-
voureth somewhat of Popish Hierarchicall disdain of them.
The scripture doubteth not to call Christian people the Lords
Clergie κληρῶν, 1. Pet. 5. 3. which title our Hierarchie now wil haue
proper (forsooth) unto themselves, because they are Lords
of Gods Heritage, as the Apostle Peter there speaketh,
κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν, and haue usurped the Churches power,
therefore they will haue their title also, and giue them a new
name for to note their distance. 4. The appropriating of these
different garments unto the discharge of the ministers function,
seemeth to discharge Preaching from being any part of a Mini-
sters function, or at least a chiefe part. For the Surplice is not
appointed to preach in. 5 That same comparison, *especially in*
dayes of peace and liberty, is first idle; because peace and liber-
ty, though they are an occasion unto wanton Lords, for to in-
uent and prescribe such toys unto their subjects; yet for diffe-
rent apparell, in the very discharge of the Ministeriall functi-
on they make no difference. For though a persecuted Minister
would be loath to be known at other times, unto every one he
meeteth; yet in the very discharge of his function, hee doth
as much desire to be discerned by his people present, as any Mi-
nister in peace and liberty: secondly, it seemeth to imply an
audacious perilous consequence: For the meaning being, that
this difference of apparell is convenient for all times, but *espe-*
cially for those that are peaceable, it must follow, that the A-
postles, not usiug such garments, did not so discharge their fun-
ctions as was convenient. 6 As for the rule of *Decencie*, which
is here made the ground of all this affirmation, it were to bee
wished that the Defendant would haue brought it into a syllo-
gisme, that we might haue seen the force of it. For now I
cannot devise what Logick will conclude different Ministeriall
garments, from Decencie; seeing Decencie was, and is, with-
out them, in a multitude of Christian Churches and Ministers:
But as some blundering Logicians, make their rule *de omni &*
de nullo, serue to proue every thing: so this Defendant would
make us belecue, that his rule of Decency will maintain any
thing that it pleaseth our spirituall Lords to impose upon us.

2 In the next place, he would proue his Decencie out of Be-
zaes twelfth Epistle, where that reverent man expressly affirm-
eth, that *the surplice is polluted with infinite superstitions, and*
worse for a Minister to wear, then a players or a fooles coat. And
what can the Defendant bring out of that Epistle for the Sur-
plice? Beza (saith he) *alloweth of distinguishing order of Citizens*
and functions, in a civill course: from whence it followeth, that
they

they are much more to be distinguished in the executing of their functions, which he declareth by the example of Iudges. To which I answer; 1 that if all this be granted, yet it maketh not for the Surplice, which is not a Civill, but an Ecclesiasticall religious habite: there is great difference betwixt a graue Civill habite, and a mysticall garment: 2 the consequence doth not follow: because in the exercising of the Ministeriall duty, nothing is requisite which the Lord himselfe doth not impose upon his Ministers. A Minister then hath another person, then when he walketh in the street. 3 There is a great disparity betwixt Iudges and Ministers in regard of their functions. For Iudges functions are Civill, and therefore subject unto mans institutions: but Ministers in their functions are onely to obserue what hee whose service they perform hath appointed. 4 For Iudges themselves (because their example is often urged) I answer: first, in the Low Countries, and (formerly at the least) in Scotland, Iudges perform their Office, very well, without such distinct apparell: secondly, neither in the Commonwealth of Israel, nor yet of the Romanes or Grecians (for any thing I could ever reade, or hear of) was any set garments appointed for Iudges: thirdly, in our own land, the Iustices of Peace at the Sessions, are Iudges of life and death in their ordinary apparell: fourthly, the very spirituall Iudges, that are Lords over the Churches in England, as Chancellours, Commissaries, Archdeacons, Officials, haue not by all the wisdom of our Convocation House, any speciall garments appointed unto them for executing of their functions. Nay, the very High Commission (where the Iudges are of all other most terrible unto many honest men) is executed without this Decencie. The Bishops themselves haue no other Robes for their Civill or Ecclesiasticall judgments, then for their other employments. The Dean of Westminster, the Bishop of Lincoln, and the L. keeper of the great Seal, appear all at this time in one and the same attire. As for the other Iudges, their habits were derived in the times of superstition, from the Monkes and Friars in all probability, with whose Coules, both they and our Vniversitie hoods, retain still, some agreement of fashion.

3 Next, he prayeth us to remember, that in the daies of Antiquity, Christian Profelyts did distinguish themselves from Roman Pagans, by casting away their gownes, and wearing of cloaks, Tert. de Pallio. Had I remembered this before, and esteemed it of any weight, or imagined that the Defendant so accounted of it, I might in the Gener. part, ch. 4, haue pressed this instance against Conformity with Idolaters. There many more pertinent examples-

amples are alledged, and yet rejected: but this it may be would haue prevailed, because it is of the Defendants owne observing. But it may in this place giue him occasion of some after-thoughts, concerning that conformitie. As for the purpose now in hand, it maketh nothing at all. For, 1. a cloak was not a distinct garment appointed as proper unto Christians, but the common attire of the Grecians. This therefore did not distinguish Christians from all Pagans, but onely from those of Rome. 2. The end and proper cause of this changing of gowne into cloak, was not to distinguish Christians from Pagans: for then the same men which at Rome cast away their gowns, and put on cloaks, should haue had as good reason at Athens, or any other citie of the Greekes, to haue cast away their cloaks, and put on gowns againe, to distinguish themselves from Grecian Pagans. 3. It doth not appeare that all Christian Proselytes did make this change, but some onely more Philosophically disposed, *summæ autoritatis viri*. i. Men of chiefe authoritie, as *Beatus Rhenanus* obserueth. 4. The plain truth is, (as not onely *Beatus Rhenanus*, but also *Iunius*, and *Pamelius* himselfe obserueth) that the reason of this change was the simplicitie and frugalitie which at that time was in the cloak, and not in the gowne. The same is confirmed out of *Hierom* writing to *Marcella*. Now from hence *Beatus Rhenanus* concludeth against the long trains, rich attire, and superfluitie of Prelats in our dayes: And his Logick herein is a great deale more consonant to the text then our defendants. For if the chiefe Christians then with danger, and reproach, did cast away ordinary gowns because of the superfluitie of them; surely they would not, if they lived now, willingly see one under the name of a Christian Bishop, with a long traine, which must be carried up after him by other men, beside a rich cope, and cassock, attended with Doctors of Divinitie, on foot, when he is on horse-back, some thirtie followers in gold chaines, beside other servants, as I haue seen the Bishop of London ride through the streets, and that onely to heare a sermon at the Spittle. This is not *à toga ad palliū*: but *à pallio ad togam, ad purpuram, ad mundi pompam*: From the gowne to the cloak, but from the cloak to the gowne, to scarlet gowne, to the pompe of the World.

4. Whereas *Bucer* sayth, *script. Angl. 705. Vbiunque me ecclesie audierunt vestes nullas singulares in administratione sacramentorum adhiberi curavi*. i. Wheresoever the Churches would giue care to me, I carefully provided that no speciall garments were used in the administration of the sacraments. The ministers english his words thus, *Bucer took order that no speciall apparell might bee appointed for the*

ministers, &c. Here the Defendant being set to catch at any word he could, most ridiculously goeth about to answer concerning the word *order*: whereas no mention was made of *ordo* *order*, but onely of *taking order*, that is, providing, or taking care, *curavi*. But passion doth make men blind.

5 Now at length he commeth to the testimonie of M. Bucer, concerning whom, first, he wouidreth at our confidence in beginning with this author, seeing *We would be loath to make end with him*: as though he would be contented to conclude with M. Beza about this matter, because he hath begun with him, in this very section: or as if it were such a poynt of confidence, to alledge the plaine words of an author, except his authoritie be followed and imitated in every point. As for reverend M. Bucer, his mind stood thus, *He did earnestly desire to haue all things in the Church, reduced to the first Apostolicall simplicitie, as well in things externall, as internall. He iudged it best, that the Surplice should be taken away, because it was occasion of superstition to some, and of pernicious contention to others, ingratefull to good men, and hurtfull to bad, he procured them to be removed out of all Churches that would heare his counsell. He wished to suffer some great bodily evill (as the losse of a leg or an arme) that they were holisamly removed out of England. But yet he thought in some cases, and with many cautions they may be used.* Now let any indifferent man judge, whether the Prelats, or we goe further with M. Bucer. We follow him at the heeles, so long as he goeth on resolutely, in a plaine way, that is, almost to the very end; where, to giue place unto the potent opposition his judgement and affections met with, hee maketh one step out of the beaten path, by a tollerable admission of that which his heart was against. The Prelats on the other side, let him goe alone, or rather set themselues against him all the way, unto the very end, and there they step in, not with him, but far beyond him. They turne his *may be* into their *must be*. In stead of his zeale for removing of the Surplice, the greatest part of their zeale (so farre as men can see in many of them) is for themselves and some ceremonies. Would godly Bucer haue dealt in these businesses as our Prelats deale? not while that grace which was given him, remained with him. By that which hath been sayd it appeareth evidently that M. Bucer wished the removall of the Surplice, not onely for the quiet of some scrupulous persons (as the Defendant sayth) which yet might make those of our Prelats which haue any of his sincere charitie in them, for to blush, but also for other weightie reasons.

SECT. II.

THE second objection brought in under the name of *M. Hy.* is, that no ministeriall habit ought to bee appropriated unto Gods worship, but such as may be well used in civill and common use. Here the Defendant answereth by arguing from *Judges robes, Wedding garments, holy dayes, Churches, communion cups, table-coverings, pulpit clothes, unto worshipping apparell*, as he calleth it. But there is not like reason: for 1. all these are meerly civill, except holy dayes, which we doe not esteem of, or distinguish from other dayes, by any appropriation: wishing that mans authoritie which giues them the title of *Holy*, may make them common dayes againe, and take order that that day which Gods commandement makes holy, may not be profaned, as it is commonly, but religiously kept once a week. But the Surplice on the other side is in state religious. Concerning the attire of Iudges, I haue answered before. The rest are not appropriated in their kinde: for the same kinde of things may be and are used in civill and common use; neither is it necessarie or generall, that the same particulars be appropriated to one use, either common or in Gods worship, but may serue for both. May not the married persons worship God in their wedding garments? Is it unlawfull to walk in Pauls? 3. None of these are instituted or appointed of what matter and forme they should alwayes be of, neither by us, nor for ought I know of, by the Prelats themselves. For as marriage garments may differ in stufte and fashion, so may Churches, cups, table-clothes, pulpit-clothes, &c. 4. The more the Defendant extol-
*leth a Minister aboue tables and pulpits, calling him, a lively or-
 gan in Gods service, a person divinely called to that sacred function, con-
 secrated to the same worship,* the more dangerous he may see it to
 be for men to impose their owne devices upon him in the exe-
 cuting of his function: and the more improbable that Christ
 hath so farre subiected his function to the pleasures of perverse
 men. Even by this his owne argument he might see, (if he did
 not stand in his owne light) that there is no paritie of reason
 betwixt wedding and worshipping apparell, no more then there
 is betwixt tables and teachers.

SECT. III.

IT fareth with this Defendant in disputing for human cere-
 monies, as it doth with many conforming unto them: the
 B 2 further

further he goeth, the more corrupt is he in his dealing about the. He would make the reader beleue that we abhorred from all white linnen: for that is the title of this section, that we accuse the Surplice for colour and matter. For which matter how little colour he had, appeareth plainly out of the words of M. Hy. which he setteth downe himselfe: wherein nothing is affirmed, but that *linnen ministeriall apparell was not anciently used in the primitive Church, as Mr Hooker in a manner granteth.* it is not the colour and matter which is here opposed, but the antiquitie of the Surplice. Not as if antiquitie were sufficient to authorize it, but to take away that vain pretence from them which haue no better plea for their cause, then prescription of time. Now for the antiquitie of the Surplice, the Defendant hath nothing to bring but the grant of *Zepperus Martyr, & Zanchie*, vvhich yet doe not speak of appropriation unto sacred use and diuine service, but onely admit of *Chrysostomes* and *Ieromes* words, as they are usually taken: not thinking of that which Mr. Cartwright further answereth, viz. that the white apparrell which *Chrysostome* and *Ierome* speak of, was nothing else but a more honest, graue, and honorable attire, which ministers then used the same dayes, as well without as within the place and time of diuine service. But this interpretation the defendant taketh cleane away, by calling it a *silly and sencelesse answer*: though he neither bringeth any reason or testimonie against it: nor yet answer to that which M. Cartwright bringeth both out of the scripture, and out of *Erasmus*, and *Iewel*, p. 254. 255. 256. *Erasmus* his words are plaine enough, *Quaquam nunc linearum vestium usus vilis, sit ac plebeius, tamen is olim nobilium erat: & honoris causa primum datus est sacerdotibus, ac proinde nulli monachorum concessus, nisi inter obeunda sacra. in Hieronymi vita*: that is, though the use of linnen garments be now a dayes base, and for every common man, yet in old time it was the wearing of Nobles, and granted to Ministers at the first for honour, and therefore no Monk might use them, saue in diuine service, in the life of *Hierome*. *Beza* also was of the same judgement, as appeareth by these words, Ep. 12. *Quod si etiam amplius libeat in res istas inquirere, difficile non fuerat ostendere, quae postea distinctioni seruiunt, primum plebeia, ac vulgaria fuisse.* 1. If any man please to inquire further into these things, it is easie to shew that things which afterward served for distinction, were at the first vulgar and common to every one. Is it enough here for a Bishop to cry out of sillinesse & sencelesseesse? In the Consistories poore men must be contented to heare such answeres, even from the Bishops servants: but in printed bookes great words will not goe for payment. Now for the further clearing of this poynt, and removing of these imputations

CHAP. I.

tations from Mr. Cartwright and others, I will here set downe certaine observations of learned Mr. Brightman about the matter, whose words are these. *Hierom* hath the words you cite, *lic. 1. adv. Pelag. p. 116.* much urged by Bellarmine and other Papists for their apparell; and no lesse vehemently pressed by our men for ours, but duely considered without cause. The *Candida vestis*, that is, the white garment, *Hierom* speaketh of, was no peculiar garment of the Ministers, but the ordinary cloathing of the common people, in former time generally used by all, and daily, but afterwards onely by those of the better sort, and upon festivall daies. So *A. Gellius* writeth of *Africanus*; *Eumque cum esset reus, neque barbam desisse radere, neque non candida veste uti, neque fuisse solito cultu reorum*; that is, That he, when he was arraigned, neither ceased to shave his beard, nor to use any garment, but white; neither that he was arrayed, as those who be arraigned use to be. The Embassadors of Rhodes, comming to Rome, *Primo in veste candida visi sunt*; that is, first they shewed themselves in white aray: but finding things contrary to their expectation, they were forced presently, *Veste sordida sumpta, principum domos circumire*, that is, To goe about the Princes houses in foule attire; *Lib. Dec. 5. l. 5. p. 254.* Yea, the very Mariners and Passengers, in a ship of *Aegypt*, seeing *Augustus* to passe by, shewed themselves, *Candidati, coronatique*: that is, In white attire and having crownes on their heads, *Sueton. Aug. c. 99.* The same *Augustus* was angry, *Visa quondam pro concione pullatorum turba*: that is, When he saw a company in mourning or black apparell in the Assembly: and therupon made a law, *Ne quis pullatorum media covea sederet*, that is, That no man having mourning or black apparell on, should sit in the middle rowe of the Stage. *Suet. Aug. c. 40. 44.* from thence grew a difference among the Citizens, not heard of in former ages, whereby some were called *candidati*, some *pullati*; *candidati*, not such as sued for offices, as in times past, but the citizens of better rank: *pullati*, the lowest of the people, and the vulgar multitude: both from the colour of the garments which they used. *Tertullian* saith of the manumitted servants, who upon their first infranchizing, appeared in their gownes, *id est*, the common vesture of the Citizens, *si famulam tuam libertate mutaveris, & vestis albe nitore, & aurei anuli honore, & patroni nomine, ac tribu mensaque honoratur, de resur. carn.* that is, If thou change the state of thy servant, by making him free, he is honoured, both with the whitenesse of garment, the honour of a golden ring, the name of a Patrone, and also to be of a Tribe, or part of the people, and with the honour of the Table. Yea, the Papists them-

selues alledge to this purpose, *Simeon Metaphrastes*, as *Baronius*,
 in the actes of *Indes & Domna*, where it is said of the multi-
 tude, *Aderant quidem impii candidis & magnificis vestibus, cele-*
brantes festum sui interitus: solus autem Indes atris indutus vestibus:
 that is, *Wicked men indeed were present, celebrating the feast of*
their destruction; but Indes alone was in black attire. And of *Ho-*
nosrius, qui alba vestimenta induit, that is, *Who put on white appa-*
rell, least he should be discovered to be a Christian: For the
 devouter Christians began to take themselves to darker colours,
 as more modest and decent; especially after the Monkes once
 began to grow in credit. 2 It is plaine out of *Hierom* him-
 selfe, that *candida vestis*, .i. the *White garment*, was no garment
 belonging to the Minister alone in divine service; but an ho-
 nest, decent and cleanly vesture, opposed to a foule, fluttish,
 ragged habit. For the Pelagians condemned glorious garments,
 as he there saith, *Vnde adjungis gloriam vestium & ornamentorum*
Deo esse contrariam: that is, *Whence thou addest that the glorie of*
garments and ornaments is contrary to God: in confutation wher-
of, hee demandeth: Quae sunt rogo inimicitiae contra Deum, si
tunicam habuero mundiorum? id est, What enmity against God is it,
I pray you, if I haue a White garment? And then presently af-
 ter, the words commonly cited: *Cavete clerici, cavete monachi,*
viduae, & virgines: periclitamini, nisi sordidos vos atque pannosos
vulgus aspexerit. Taceo de hominibus saeculi, quibus aperte bellum
indicitur, & inimicitiae contra Deum, si pretiosis atque nitentibus
utantur exuviis: that is, *Take heed to your selues yee Clerkes, take*
heed yee Monkes, Widdows and Virgins, ye be in danger, except the
common people see you in foule and ragged garments. I say nothing
of the Lay men of the World, against whom open warre and enmi-
tie against God is proclaimed, if they use any precious and shining
attire. By which it is evident, he defended comely honest attire,
 such as was common to Monkes, Widdows, Virgins, & *homi-*
nibus saeculi, .i. *Lay men*, not proper to any office of the Mini-
 ster. So in *Ecclis. 9. 8*, expounding what *candida vestimenta*, .i.
White garments be; he saith, *Cave ne quando pollutis vestibus in-*
duaris: populus quippe peccator in vestibus fuscis luxisse describitur:
tu autem induere lucem, & non maledictionem &c. i. Take heed lest
at any time thou put on foule apparell; for the sinfull people is said
to haue mourned in dark or black attire, but put thou on light and
not a curse. If *Candida vestimenta*, .i. *White garments*, should be
 onely Ministers apparell, then *Solomons* exhortation is onely to
 Ministers, and they are the men he willeth to be merry, and
 alwaies to haue on their Surplices, not onely in their Ministe-
 riall duty. In his precepts to *Nepotian*, he adviseth thus, *Vester*
pullas

pullas aque devita, ac candidas: ornatus, ut sordes, pari modo fugiende sunt: quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet: id est, Avoide black garments as much as white, trimme and sordide or foul garments, are equally to be avoided, for the one smells of nicenesse and delicacie, and the other of glorie and honour. Would he have willed him to avoide white garments in common life (for make it a Ministeriall garment, and then you haue Hieroms counsell against it) had they not been usuall? In Divine service therefore the Ministers used the white garment of the people: but in ordinary life, Hierom thought a meaner cloathing fitter; and so some devouter, as Nepotian, and such like practised: though others differed nothing, in their ordinary attire, from the people. 3 There was no set ministring garment in Hieroms time, and therefore candidi vestis; i. the white garment, was not such. For Celestinus, who was not Bishop till after Hieroms death, writeth thus to the French Bishops concerning apparell in Divine service, among whom this superstition began to spring: *Discernendi à plebe vel ceteris, sumus, doctrina, non veste: conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu; nam si studere incipimus novitati, traditam nobis a patribus ordinem calcabimus, & locum supervacuis superstitionibus faciemus. Rudes ergo fidelium mentes ad talia non debemus inducere, docendi enim potius sunt quam illudendi, Nec imponendum est eorum oculis, sed mentibus infundendi præcepta sunt;* that is, We are to be discerned from the common people, or others; by doctrine, not by apparell; by conversation, not by outward habite; by purity of minde, not by attire. For if we begin to follow noveltie, we will hold that order which the ancient haue prescribed to us, and omit vain superstitions; therefore we ought not to draw the rude minds of the faithfull to such things; they be rather to be instructed then mocked: we must not seeke, as jugglers, to deceiue their eyes and sight, but fill their minds with instructions. I know, Mirianus Victorius, in that Nepotian when he died bequeathed his garment to Hierom, which he had used in the ministry of Christ (*Hier. ad Heliod.*) as also out of that forementioned place (in *Pelag.*) thinks he hath found their albe, planet, camisia, casula, and I know not what: But Nepotians garment was no other then hath been shewed. Oaely, as he was a man humble, and of modest, and meanest attire in ordinary life; so in matters of his Ministry, he was fine, neat, and magnificent. *Solicitus si niteret altare, si parietes absque fuligine, si pavimenta tersa;* id est, Carefull that the altar were fair, the walles without smok, the floure swept, &c. And therefore no doubt, in that action, arraying himselfe, without any note of pride, after the best manner of the people, he might well bequeath

bequeath that garment to *Hierom*, who had it been never so mean, would have esteemed it for the donors sake. Obserue also by the way, that *Nepolians* ministring garment was none of the Churches goods, but provided at his own cost. It is objected also that *Stephanus* Bishop of Rome in *Cyprians* time, ordained peculiar ministring garments, as is recorded by *Polyd. de inv. lib. 6. cap. 12*, and by *Isidroe*. Vnto which you may adde *Gratian*, if you will, *de consecr. dist. 1*. But though *Stephanus* flourished before Antichrist was hatched, yet he is too yong to be a lawfull Authour of any such garments. Beside, who seeth not, by that alledged out of *Celestine*, 160 yeares at least after *Stephen*, that decree of *Stephen* to be a meer forgerie? Was it a novel y to bring in any such apparell in *Celestines* time; and yet had prescription of such antiquity? But the Centurie Writers haue discovered the forgerie by many arguments: so that I marvaile any man of learning should seek any strength from such a rotten foundation. *Chrysostome* when he saith, (*Hæc est dignitas vestra, hæc stabilitas, hæc corona, non quia tunicam induiti candidissimam, per Ecclesiam ambulatis*, that is, *This is your dignity, this is your stability, this is your Crown, not because ye walk through the Church clad with a very white garment. hom. 83. in Mat.*) necessarily requireth the same interpretation. For this most white coat, was no other then the better sort of people did usually wear, as well in other Countries as at Rome, as hath been shewed, by the Embassadors of Rhodes, and the Shipmen of Egypt. Onely the Bishops in humility, thought it too sumptuous for daily use, and reserved it for the time of their publick function. And therefore *Sisinimus*, a Novation Bishop, living in Constantinople, at the same time with *Chrysostome* and clothing himselfe not onely in his Ministry, but for his ordinary rayment in white, was deranded by one, *διὰ τί ἀνδρῶν ἱερῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ποικίλη φέρονται?* &c. *Wherefore he wore a garment, not fit or convenient for a Bishop? Secr. 1.6.c. 22*. Where it is to be observed, it was an unwonted garment in ordinary use, for Bishops, not for other men: And unwonted in ordinary use, not in Divine use, in which the Bishop was allowed, without any grudge, such dignity of apparell, as was then received by men of best place. Adde hereunto these observations of *M. Brightman*: 1 That *Chrysostome* every where confoundeth, *Vestes candidas, splendidas, puras*: that is, *Putteth white, gorgeous, pure garments one for another*: opposing them to *sordide*, that is, *sordide*, in *Mark. hom. 10. ad pop. Ant. 61*. 2 That *Hierom* in the Epitaph of *Nepotian* sheweth, that white linnen garments were in those daies, one part of a Souldiers braue attire. *In palatii militis, sub clamyde*

O cendente lino, corpus eius cilicio tritum fuit, that is, *Vnder his cloak, or white linnen, his body was warme with a garment made of hair.* 3 That in his Treatise, *De suspecto contubernio*, he maketh ordinary wearing of white, a property of wanton yong men, whom he calleth, *Comatos, linteatosque iuvenes*, that is, *Yong men with bushes of hair, and wearing linnen garments.* 4 That in his epistle *ad Sabinianum*, a Monke, he accuseth and chideth him, for this among other things, *Amicivis linteis*, that is, *Thou art clothed with linnen garments.*

By that time these allegations be well considered, it will appear, that Mr. Cartwr. answer is not *silly* and *senselesse* (as the Def. would haue it thought, because he cannot otherwise confute it) but Dr. Mortons censure *rash* and *groundlesse*. But this (saith he) is a *betraying of the whole cause*. Why so I pray? For if it be lawfull for a Minister to use a distinct habite in respect of an holy day, then may he as lawfully distinguish himselfe from others in respect of an holy act. Of distinction from all others by apparel, neither Mr. Cartwright, nor yet Hierome, nor Chrysostome, nor any other ancient Writer saith any thing at all So this danger of treason which the Def. warneth us of, is a meere dreame or vaine imagination.

SECT. III. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X.

IN all the following Sections, I finde nothing at all but trifling Tautologie, mixed (in all probability) with some injurious dealing.

The *signification* of our ceremonies, handled before in the third chapter of the Generall part, is brought forth againe in the fourth Section.

The resemblance which they haue to Iewish rites, propounded here Sect. 5, was handled before ch. 4. sect. 16.

In the sixth Section, the same is repeated againe, with some injurie (I doubt) done unto Mr. Nic. for the words there brought in under his name doe not sound as if they were his. Howsoever, it pertaineth nothing to the main Question, whether they stand or fall.

In the seventh, a question is moved about the authour of the Surplice, whether Pope Stephen did first appropriate the same unto Gods worship. This Assertion is fahered upon Mr. Hi. and Mr. Hy. now whatsoever becommeth of Mr. Hi. Mr. Hy. sure hath wrong. For the same man is brought in before, Sect. 3, avouching that no distinct Ministeriall apparell was anciently used, no not in Hieroms and Chrysostomes daies, who
C lived

lived after *Stephen*, and it hath been there declared, that there was no likelyhood of any such thing to haue been after their time. So that howsoever some other superstitions were of the fore-working of *Antichrist*, yet this *Babylonish* garment, which was the Whores attire, even in the act of her whoredom, was chosen by her self, being now present, as was meet it should.

The eighth Section is about the idolatrous abuse of the Surplice by the Papists: which was handled before ch 4, where it hath been shewed, that such a clout as the Surplice is, having lyen upon a plague sore so long as it hath, ought to be avoided as infectious.

The ninth Section (by his confession) is *Colewoorts twice sod*, for once we haue been cloyed with the same stuff, p. 1. ch. 2. Sect. 12.

The tenth and last Sect. is nothing else but a flanting bravado, by mustering all the former Tautologies into one parado.

CHAP. II. SECT. I.

ABout the Crosse, there is the more work, by reason of the Defendants preposterous dealing. For whereas the second commandment was alledged in the Abridgment, p. 31, as the main ground of condemning all likenesses invented by man for religious use, which was their first prooffe of that which the Def. maketh our third generall argument against the Ceremonies: There he would take no knowledge of it at all in the right place: but bringeth it in here under the names of Mr. *Gif.* Mr. *Nic.* & Mr. *Lang.* But let us take it where we finde it, and examine his answer. The argument is; that the second commandment forbiddeth all images or similitudes of mans making for religious use; His answer is, that *This is a new piece of Catechisme, never heard of before. And that the image or similitude forbidden in the second Commandment, is that only which is used for an outward resemblance and description of the Godhead.* I adde unto his words, the particle *only*, but not to his sense: for that must be his meaning, or else hee no way contradicteth the objection propounded. Hee himselfe also addeth it in the next Section. Now for this answer, 1. I would aske him, why (by way of scorn) he calleth an exposition of the commandment a *PIECE* of Catechisme? Is there nothing contained in the commandments beside principles of Catechisme which children are to learn? I doubt not to affirm, that there is more corn under that straw, then hee knoweth of. *I haue seen an end of all perfection* (saith David)

but

but thy commandment is exceeding large. Neither need he be ashamed to learn yet more and more, of any that can help him, the meaning of every commandment. I for my part make more account of one such a piece of Catechism, if by good consequence out of the Scripture it be confirmed, then of one hundred of humane testimonies, though they come from the most ancient Doctors. 2 Why doth he say (and content himselfe with saying) that this Exposition was *never heard of before*? He could not possible but see in the Abridgement, which hee professeth to answer, *Bucer, Farel, Fulk*, and Dr. Andrews himselfe alledged, as authors of this interpretation, pag. 310, to whom many other (if not all our Divines that haue written upon the commandments) might be added, as consenting plainly with them. 3 What could be more inconsiderate, then to affirm, that *onely those images are excluded in the second commandment, which men erect for representation of the Godhead*? The ten commandments are called *ten Words*, *Exod 34.28. Deut. 4.13*, not that there is no more contained in them, then the very words at the first sight doe make shew of, as this *Defend.* seemeth to conceiue: but because the most wise God, for our good hath comprised the summe of all our duty in very few words: which therefore must of necessity be, not onely *gravis*, i. *Weighty*; but also *grauis*, i. *With thilde*, containing as it were in the womb of one word, many things of moment. This our Saviour teacheth plainly, when he saith, That *the whole Law and Prophets hang upon these two Tables*, *Mat 22.40*: This he sheweth also in his reforming interpretation of the Law, *Mat. 5*, where in many particular passages hee expressly gainsayeth the Pharisaicall conceit that this *Defend.* seemeth to renew. The same truth appeareth also, in that the Decalogue is usually in Scripture stiled, *Gods Testimony and Covenant*, as containing all that is required. Neither is there any sin which is not a breach of this Law, *1 Iob 3.4*. Vpon these grounds it is a rule generally received of all Divines without contradiction: That *Omnia mandata sunt brevissima synecdoche, quibus multo plura continentur, quam verbis explicetur*: that is, *All the commandments be very short Synecdoches (by which a part is put for the whole figuratiuely) in which many more things be contained then be expressed in the words.* And this is very fitly applyed particularly unto the second commandment by *Zanchie*, whom the *Defend.* constraineth, as it were by racking, to speak for him in the next Section. *Vrsin.* also (of whom the *Defend.* saith, that hee *hath catobized us well* about these matters) giveth this for a caveat, *Cavendum me nimis anguste precepta; sem-*

perigitur in genere species omnes, in specie præcipua etiam cognatæ species, & totum genus, &c. that is, *We must take heed, that we give not too narrow an exposition of the commandments, therefore we are ever to understand all the particulars under or in the generall, and in the chiefe or principall species or particular, we are to comprehend all the particulars of the same kind, and the whole genus or generall &c.* The evidence of this truth is such, that the blind Jewes doe see it. For so is the rule of Philo, *χρῆ δὲ με' δεκάινω ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι οἱ δεκά λόγοι κεφαλαιῶς νόμων εἰ σὶ τῶν ἐν εἰδεῖ παρ' ὅλην τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἐν ταῖς ἱερᾶς βίβλοις ἀναγεγραμμένων*; that is, *This we ought to know, that the tenne words be chiefe heads of those Lawes which be in particular described in the holy Bible, where ever the Law is given, De decem. serm. pag. 523.* Much more might be said to this purpose, but this is enough to any that hath eares to heare, and eyes to see. Onely, this I will adde, that a great many of the Papists are much beholding to the Defend. For *Durandas in sent. li. 2. d. 9. q. 2,* with whom many therin consent, saith plainly, that it is a foolish thing, to make any images for the representation of the Godhead: so that their images are now acquitted by the Def. from all that the second commandment hath to say against them. 4 Now for the very point, that the second commandment forbiddeth all images, or likenesses for religious use. First, all will-worshipping of God is forbidden in this commandment, by the consent of all Divines, that are not Popish: but images in religious use are worship, and invented by man, are will-worship, as the Def. himselfe confesseth p. 1, c. 2, ergo. Secondly, the significant ceremonies which God appointeth, are to be observed by force of this commandment, or else by none: but to all that God appointed, man is forbidden to adde, by like appointments, *Deut. 12. 32. Annon enim illa semel Ecclesie dicta lex, æterna manet, quod præcipio tibi, hoc observabis ut facias, non addes quicquam vel detrahes?* that is, *For doth not the Law which was once given to the Church, abide eternall? What I command thee, that thou shalt observe to doe it, thou shalt neither adde any thing to it, nor take any thing from it. Calv. inst. l. 4. c. 10. f. 17.* Thirdly, that vain worship which our Saviour accuseth, Pharisaicall washings, and such like precepts of men, *Matth 15. 9.* is forbidden by the second commandment: for it was not against the first, by setting up of a new God; nor against the third, by the unlawfull manner of exercising lawfull; but a reall and actuall vain-worship: nor against the fourth, by transgression in time: Much

Much more therefore are human significant Ceremonies used by the Minister, in his holy function, in the presence of God and his congregation, for Gods honour, and the peoples instruction, vaine worship against the same commandement. Fourthly, the abolishing of other Popish ceremonies, was by vertue and authoritie of the second commandement: as it is plaine in images of wood, stone, &c. Neither will the Defendant (I think) say, but even salt, spittle, oyle, &c. are removed out of our worship in obedience to the second commandement: otherwise he must shew some other commandement that required the abolishing of them: or else acknowledge that they were unjustly condemned and rejected by our Churches, and rather to be recalled with acknowledgement of our rashnesse and error, then to be resisted any longer with disputes. Now if the abolishing of them be according to the second commandement, the reteining of other humane ceremonies of the same nature with them, must needs bee against the same commandement. The received judgement of our divines is (as *Vrsine*, unto whom the Defendant sendeth us to bee catechised, sayth) that in this commandement we are forbidden to bring into the worship of God mens inventions. *Cultum ab hominibus excogitatum aut confictum. Cultum fictitium; quem Deus non prescripsit, superstitionem adlentem praeceptis divinis inventa humani*: that is, A worship invented or feigned by men, a feigned worship which God hath not prescribed, a superstition adding humane inventions to Gods commandements. *V. c. catech. q. 95. Pertinet enim ad idololatriam, cum Deum verum alijs modis atque ritibus colimus, quam ipse voluerit, aut prescripserit*: that is, For it belongeth to idolitry when we worship the true God by other meanes and rites then he would have, or hath appointed. *Mart. loc. com. p. 191.*

SECT. II.

Calvin (saith the Defendant) and Zinchie find nothing forbidden in the second commandement, but onely the representation of God by an image, and adoration of any image.

The crosse is said to haue done marvels, and among other things to haue opened the eyes of some blind men: but in this Defendant it seemeth to haue wrought a contrary effect, no lesse to be marvelled at. For if the crosse had not sealed up his eyes, how could he look upon Calvin or Zinchie, and see no more of their sentence? In the institutions of Calvin, these words are found, *l. 2. c. 8. f. 17. Finis secundi praecepti est, superstitionis ritibus legitimam suam cultum non vult profanari: quare in summa, nos à carnalibus*

carnalibus observatiunculis, quos stolidi mens nostra, ubi Deum pro sua crassitie concepit, comminisci solet, in totum revocat & abstrahit. Quod autem est in hac transgressione crassissimum vitium notat: idololatricam externam: that is, The end of the second commandment is, hee will not haue his lawfull worship profaned by superstitious rites, wherefore the summe is, that he calleth us back wholly, and draweth us away from carnall observations, which our foolish mind is wont to devise, when it hath conceived of God, according to it owne grosseesse. And upon Exod. 20. *Summa est, spiritualement esse Dei cultum, ut eius nature respondeat, etsi enim de idolis verba facit Moses, dubium tamen non est, quin per synecdochen (sicut in tota lege) omnes fictitios cultus damnet, quos pro suo ingenio homines excogitant. Hinc enim carnales mixturae in viliando Dei cultu, &c. that is, The summe is, that the worship of God is spirituall, that it may be answerable to his nature: for though Moses speak of Idols, yet there is no doubt, but that by the figure Synecdoche, whereby one kind is put for the rest, (as in the whole law is usuall, he condemneth all feigned worship, which men devise on their own head, for from the inventions of mens own braines be all those carnall mixtures risen, whereby Gods worship is defiled. Beside, Calvin referreth all the instituted worship of God unto the second commandment, and at large describeth it all in above an hundred pages, that thereby hee might the more fully expaine that one commandment: his words are plaine in Deut. 12-4. *Tota externa cultus Dei professio apte secundo precepto annectitur: quia ex eo dependet, nec alio tendit, quam ad ejus observationem.* that is, The whole outward profession of Gods worship is fitly adioyned to the second commandment; because it dependeth upon it, and tendeth to no other end then to the observation of it. Now if all the ceremonies which God instituted, pertaine to the keeping of this commandment, surely those ceremonies which man bringeth in, must needs pertaine to the breaking of it. For this commandment is wholly negative in regard of mans institutions.*

So also Zanchie, *Summa est (meo quidem iudicio) secundi precepti, in externo cultu qui Deo debetur, seu in ceremonijs, nihil nobis esse ex nostro capite comminiscendam, neque ex ritibus gentilium idololatrarum adhibendum: sed eo contentos cultu, iisque ceremonijs esse debere; quas ipsi placuerit prescribere, aut permittere, sive sacramenta, sive sacrificia, sive alia sacra fuerint, uti sunt templa, altaria, vestes, vasaque ad cultum externum necessaria:* that is, The summe (in my judgment) of the second commandment is, that we ought to devise nothing of our own head in the worship which is due to God, or in ceremonies; neither ought we to use any of the rites of heathenish Idolaters; but ought to be content with that worship, and with those ceremonies, which it hath pleased

pleased him to prescribe, or permit, whether they be sacraments or sacrifices, or other holy things, as temples, altars, garments, and vessels necessarie for the outward worship. De red. l. i. c. 14. what could any of the Non-conformists haue layd more fully against our ceremonies.

Then (sayth the Defendant) away with all art of carving and painting. Then? Wae? If no image of mans inventing be lawfull in religious use, or Gods service? for this is the objection Sect. 1. Away (say I) with this art of painting arguments in false colours. For the civill art of carving and painting, there is room enough out of Gods service. It is as if the sellers which Christ cast out of the Temple Math. 21. should haue cried out, that all buying and selling must be left, if it may not be practised in the Temple.

But God himselfe appointed images of Cherubims, Lyons, &c. in his Tabernacle. To this 1. Zanchie answereth, de red. c. 14. *Non facies tibi, intellige, ex tuo capite, sine meo expresso verbo aut iussu. Ergo non praescribit sibi legem Deus, quin possit jubere fieri imagines, prout ipsi visam fuerit, sicut postea iussit fieri cherubinos, & alias imagines in templo: sed nobis praescribit legem generalem, quam nunquam licet transgredi, nisi peculiare accedat verbum Dei, ita refellitur inepta exceptio pontificiorum; Salomon fecit Cherubinos, & in templo posuit: ergo & nos possumus imagines in templis collocare; that is, Thou shalt not make to thy selfe, understand thus: of thy own head and devise, without my expresse Word or command: therefore God giues not a law to himselfe, but that he may command Images to be made, as hee thinkes good, as afterward he commanded the Cherubims and other Images to be made in the temple: but he hath given us a generall law, which we may never transgresse, except we haue a special Word of God: so the absurd exception of the Romanists is confuted: 1. Salomon made Cherubims and placed them in the temple. Therefore we also may place images in Temples. 2. D. Morton answereth in the prot. appeale, ca. 27. sect. 2. out of the Iesuits themselves. Vasquez and Azorius, who teach, that the pictures and images then in use served for the ornament of the Temple, but were never applied by the Iewes unto holy worship.*

SECT. III.

Here an objection is brought in, concluding that the crosse is used as a substantiall part of Gods worship. To this the Defendant answereth, out of the goodly Canons which B. Bancroft with his Clergie framed, concluding 1. That the infant is fully baptised before it be crossed, or though it be not crossed. 2. That
it

it is also received into the Church by baptism. 3. That the crosse is no signe of Baptisme. What shall we think of this disputer? He setteth downe his adversaries conclusion thus, *The crosse is a substantiall part of Gods worship*: he contradieth it by laying, *It is no part of Baptisme, nor signe of Baptisme*. May it not therefore be a part of Gods worship: yea, may it not be an addition to baptism? Beside, we are not to iudge by the booke of Canons, or by any verball profession of deceitfull men, what is an addition to Gods worship, but by the book of God. The Papists confesse as much in words as our convocation doth, viz. that all the ceremonies which they use in baptism, beside Gods owne ordinances, are no necessarie parts of the sacrament, but rather for solemnitie. *Thomas Aquinas in summa*, p. 3. q. 66. ar. 10. *Bellarmino* also is bold, and saith, they lie in their throats, that say the Papists hold their ceremonies necessarie, *de Missa*, l. 2. c. 13. yet he must be a good friend of the Papists that will deny them to use many ceremonies as substantiall parts of Gods worship, and additions unto baptism. The truth is, that the true outward worship of God is an action of pietie, wherein we giue honour to God in religious use of those certaine meanes according to his revealed will. It must needs therefore be, that where either there is a new meanes added unto those which God hath appointed; or a new use of the old meanes, that there is an addition made to Gods worship. The Papists salt, spittle, oyle, chrisme, &c. being so many new meanes used for the honor of God, are so many additions also to the sacrament. So likewise the crosse, being a new meanes, is a meere addition.

SECT. III.

THAT the Defendant may seeme to giue a full answer unto the ministers abridgement, he catcheth here and there at some peeces of their words, but weakneth them first by displacing and dis-joynting. So here, whereas in the Abridgement for stopping a mule wher at the crosses proctors use to make an escape, viz. that it is not used untill baptism is ended, bring this bush among others, that *it is usually made whiles the words of institution are in pronouncing*. Now these words the Defendant bringeth in as if their scope were to proue the crosse derogatory from baptism, as he speaketh in the title of this section: or for no distinct end, but *ergo, &c.* as he leaveth them in the objection it selfe. But 1. if he looked upon that place in the Abridgement which he quoteth, pag. 41. why did hee not giue some answer unto the testimonies of *Calvin, Bullinger, Martyr, Polanus,*

Polanus, Keckerman, Willet, Chemnitius, brought in as witnessing that the proper offices of baptism are ascribed by our Prelates unto the Crosse, and that therefore it is to bee condemned?

2. Why did he not take notice also of another reason, whereby the same evasion is prevented which these words in hand belong unto, as the first by name, but passe it over in silence? Surely this is but poore disputing, to passe by that which is the strength, and take the hedge where it is lowest. Yet let us heare his answer to this. The summe thereof is, *that they which do make the signe of the crosse whilst the words of institution are in pronouncing, doe contrary to their direction, and it were our part either to reforme them, or to informe the Church against them.* To which I reply, 1. If they doe it without book, yet seeing that sometime they cannot conveniently crosse at all, except they doe it then, because those that hold the children for baptism, doe not willingly hold them also to be crost; and seeing many times they intend thereby to advance the honor of the crosse, as also to crosse them the more who dislike crossing, most of our Prelates will hold them excused. 2. We doe not seek to reforme them, partly because we are accounted by them as excommunicated persons, and so disabled for that office: and partly because we see little or no difference betwixt crossing in, and presently after the pronouncing of the words of baptism. For as is alledged in the abridgement, the whole Liturgie appointed for the administration of baptism, is the worship of God, (and in some sense baptism) of which the crosse cannot be denied to bee a part; whence it is that the convocation it selfe stileth it *the crosse in baptism*, Can. 30. So that the Defend. is ridiculously bold in taking upon him to giue it a new name, in spite of the convocation, calling it in the very title of his book, *the crosse after baptism*. 3. If we did esteeme it a thing fit to be brought in question, yet wee need not informe the Church or congregation whereto such a minister belongeth, for it is sufficiently knowne there. And if the Defendant meaneth by his Church the Bishops Chancelor, or the Bishop himselfe, then we answer, that we acknowledge no such Church to bee of Gods making. Beside they haue Church wardens, and Side-men their sworne (I might say forsworne) servants, of whom they may and ought to be informed of such abuses. They inquire of those simple men, and that upon their oathes, concerning many trifles, and sometime of such things as they cannot possibly know. As for example, one Bishop lately had this for one article to bee inquired on of the Church-wardens, *Whether their Ministers did expound the scriptures according to the interpretation of the ancient Fathers,*

thers, or no. It were more agreeable to make this an article of inquisition about the right time of crossing, which those poore men could much better answer, then such questions as the former is.

SECT. V.

Here two positions are alledged out of the Abridgement, brought in there to shew that the placing of the crosse after the action of baptisme, doth not free it from being esteemed a part of Gods worship: but by the Defendant applied unto the prooffe of another conclusion. The first standeth thus in the Abridgment. *By this reason it may as well be denied, that it was made a part of Gods worship in popish baptism, seing they use it before the very act of baptising, as we use it after.* p. 41. 42. The other is in these words, *The using of it after baptism is worse then if it were used before. For it giveth occasion to revivue that error, which Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrose held of it, who used it in the confirming of those which were first baptised, because they thought that what was begun by baptism, was to bee consummate and made perfect by it.* Now to all this the Defendant answereth nothing at all; but telleth us, 1. *That the Fathers used the Crosse immediately before baptism, and so the Papists also, in a worse manner: but our Church after Baptisme, laying over againe that which is opposed.* 2. He complaineth that *our Church is calumniously traduced as worse then the Popish: whereas in the Abridgment there is no such comparison made of our Church and the Popish, nor yet of our crossing and theirs, considered in all the circumstances of it: but onely of crossing before, and crossing after cæteris paribus.* 3. He speaketh of *our reason taken from the superstitious opinion of Romists concerning confirmation: whereas in the position there is no mention made at all of Popish confirmation.* 4. He declareth the doctrine of our Church concerning confirmation, viz. that *it is onely a calling of the baptised to a personall profession of their faith.* Which though it be nothing to the purpose, yet seemeth evidently false. For it is well knowne that some which haue often been at the communion, are after confirmed. Nay lately, a Doctor of Divinitie, and Arch-deacon, was so wise, as to offer himselfe unto the Bishop to be confirmed, and the Bishop was so wise as to bestow it upon him. I hope his profession was knowne before: there was surely somewhat else in the winde. Beside, why is it, that onely Bishops can confirme? can none but they call men to the confession of their faith? There is never a School-dame which teacheth the Primer, wherein our catechisme

teichism is cōtained, but she can cal her scholers to as good a profession of their faith, as the Bishops require. 5. He telleth us, that *our Church hath placed the crosse after Baptism, to remoue the superstitious opinion of the Papists, which used it before.* In which affirmation there wanteth both reason and also truth. Reason, because the superstition of the crosse doth not consist in placing before, neither can it be removed by placing after, any more then the Altar of Damascus, which was placed on the North-side of the the Lords Altar, 2. *Reg.* 16. 14. was therefore idolatrous because it was on the North side, or could haue been purged from idolatry if it should haue been placed more Southerly. Truth also seemeth to be wanting: because the Papists use the crosse not onely before, but also after the act of baptisme. For as *Bellarmino* witnesseth, *de baptis. c.* 27. the Popish chrisme is administred presently after baptisme, not in the forehead, as in confirmation, but in the crowne of the head. Now chrisme is annoynting in forme of a crosse, *Bell. de confirm. c.* 8. so that the remouall of the superstition which the Defendant speaketh of (so farre as it concerneth the crosse in it selfe) is no further then from the crowne of the head to the forehead, which in a little child especially is a very little way. The zeale of Gods house which was in our Saviour, led him to whip and driue prophane things quite out of the court of the Temple, *Ioh.* 2. 17. It caused *Iosia* also not onely to cast idolatrous vessels out of the temple, but also to burn them without Ierusalem, in the fields of Kedron, & to carry the powder of them into Bethel, 2. *Reg.* 23. 4. If the like zeale were in our Bishops, we should not heare them thus to talk of remouing superstition from before baptism, and bringing of it after, as of a great reformation. 6. He willeth us to *compare this alteration and our obiection concerning confirmation together, and then dispute, whether an error in baptisme be not ncerer unto the corrupting of the sacrament of baptisme, then to the corrupting of the doctrine of confirmation, which is out of baptisme: as a wound in the head more indangereth the braine, then if it be in the heele.* In all which words if there be either head or heele of any reason appertaining to the present purpose, it passeth the reach of my braine. For 1. the obiection was not concerning confirmation, but concerning the erroneous conceit that led some Fathers to confirme with the crosse. 2. It maketh no more error in baptisme to crosse before it, then to crosse after it. 3. There was no comparison at all betwixt corrupting of baptisme, and corrupting of confirmation: But the crosse is affirmed to corrupt both. 4. What sence or proportion is this? *As a wound in the*

head doth more indanger the braine then if it be in the heel, so an error in baptisme doth more hurt unto baptisme then unto confirmation.

SECT. VI.

NOW the Defendant (according to his owne method) turneth back, and reciteth one of the first reasons which in the Abridgement is brought to proue that the crosse is an addition to baptisme, viz. *because it is used as a signe and token of the profession the child must make, and of the spirituall combat that it must fight, which is one proper use and end to which baptisme doth serue, and for which it was ordained.*

His answer is as before, not by denying any part of the reason, but by saying something about the signifying which is in baptisme, and that which is in the crosse. *Baptisme* (sayth he) *is a signe betwixt man and God: but the crosse is onely a signe betwixt particular men, viz. betwixt the members of the Church, and the Church it selfe. Besides, baptisme is a signe of regeneration: but the crosse is a signe of constant profession of Christianitie.* But 1. why is nothing answered to the many testimonies which are brought in, averring that which is attributed to the crosse, to be proper unto baptisme? 2. Sacraments are not onely signes betwixt God and man, but also betwixt man and man: as betwixt fathers and their children, *Exod. 12. 26. 27.* they are as tokens upon our hands, and frontlets betwixt our eyes, to testifie our profession unto all that see them, or know of them, *Exod. 13. 9.* This was so in the sacraments of the old testament, and dare any deny it of those which are in the new? *Hooker* was not so forgetfull: for he sayth plainly of the sacraments, they are the *badges of our profession*, which is the language of Scripture, used by all good divines. 3. It is also inconsiderate, that he saith, *The crosse doth signifie betwixt the Church and the members of it*; for as the sacraments doe signifie our profession to all beholders, whether within or without the Church, so also doth the crosse: and the best use it ever had, was in respect of the heathen without the Church. 4. If baptisme be a signe of all regeneration, then of all that is good and holy even in the outward man, *1. Thes. 5. 23.* and so of our constant profession also. Lastly, the Apostles professed their faith, I hope, as perfectly as any of them that crosse and crosse againe, without any such mockerie: and so doe thousands at this day: to say nothing how the crosse now is become in part a profession of Poperie, as *Gregorie Martine* in his treatise of Schismes sheweth.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

IT is alledged also in the Abridgement, that *the last Canons doe affirme, that the child is dedicated to the service of Christ, Can. 30.* Whereto the Defendant 1. confessing, that this word is of doubtfull ambiguitie, sayth, that *We should be of those cleane creatures which divide the hoofe and chew the cud, distinguishing the sence of it.* Where, to passe by his dalying with Scripture phrases, because that is the ordinary ornament of many of our Prelates and prelatieall mens discourses, what cleanness was in those creatures which being assembled (in outward shew) to provide for the peace of the Church, by reforming of abuses, and clearing of doubts, which had bred dissention, devised a new phrase, more popish then any that was formerly found in any of our Canons, Rubricks, or service orders, about the crosse? Was it their office to tie knots, that other may dissolue them by quaint distinctions? or to provide pills for to try our teeth in the chewing of them. 2. He helpeth us with a distinction at a dead list, viz. *Dedication is either declaratiue, by way of protestation: or else consecratiue, by consecration. So a Chappell or Church is dedicated declaratiuely by the vow and promise of him that built it: but it is consecratiuely dedicated by the Bishops prayers, and other religious rites. And thus a child is dedicated by consecration, through Baptisme: but by declaration through the signe of the Crosse.* And is this all the helpe he can doe us? Surely the poore men that make conscience of their practise in this kinde, may chew and chew againe upon these morsels, even till their gummes ake, ere they shall know how to digest them: For 1. to *dedicate* and to *consecrate* are all one. To distinguish therefore dedication into declaration and consecration, is nothing else but to distribute *dedication* into *declaration* and *dedication*. 2. Doe not the Bishops solemnities more declare the dedication of a Church or Chappell, then the builders vow or promise, which may be privat? 3 For the consecrating of Churches by Bishops, I would faine know upon what ground, or with what meaning it is used. Godly Bucer, who went as tenderly over our service booke as hee possibly could, condemneth notwithstanding such consecration of creatures, *Censur. c. 9. & 16.* If it be good in Churches, why is it not used in Surplices, and other like vessels? Is not the worship every way as good which is done in a Church unconsecrated, as that which is prepared by consecration? If yea, then consecration is idle, and to be reiected: If no, then what shall wee say to that worship which the Apostles did use in houses? This is Bu-

cers reason, c. 16, *Adalbertus* Bishop of Prage, who lived in the time of *Otto* the second, and *Benedict* the seventh was chosen Bishop by the people (where by the way popular election of Bishops is to be noted to have been continued a long time in some places) and being elected, he behaved himselfe like a true Pastor, not like one of our Lordly Bishops, *Nulli plus nota propria domus, quam illi, quis, quo nomine, & in qua parte cubaret infirmus, aut quot capita redibiva salus vite, quot fatalis hora mitteret leto*, that is, no man knew his own house better then hee knew it; Who, by what name the sick man was called, in what part of the house the sicke man lay, how many were restored to health, how many dyed. Which I note also obiter, i. by the way, to shew how like our Bishops are unto those good Bishops that lived even in declining and dark times. Afterward, he found his people refractarie, and therefore would be their Bishop no longer. It was not honour and wealth that tied him to a Bishoprick, or could make him aspire and clime from a meaner Bishoprick unto a greater, which is our Prelats open practise. After this, *Rogatus idem a monachis, qui in monte Cassino ad Benedicti regaliam vivebant, ut secum manere vellet, quia Episcopus cum esset, eorum Ecclesias sacrare posset, respondisse fertur, utrum me hominem vel asinum putatis, ut cum amota filiorum cura, Episcopus esse desisterem, nunc sub nomine Episcopi, vestras domos consecrarem*: that is, Being desired of the Monkes, who lived after the order of *Benedict* in the *Cassine* mountaine, that he would stay with them, because he being a Bishop might consecrate their Churches: hee is said to have given this answer; Whether doe yee hold me to be a man or an Asse; that after I have given over to be a Bishop, having put away the care of children, I should now under the name of a Bishop consecrate your houses? Hee thought it a work fit for no man, but an Asse, under the name of a Bishop, to consecrate Chapels and Churches. *Cosmas, Pragensis decanus, coaevus, auctor ejus vite* f 6, & 7.

4 Lastly, doth not Baptism declare the consecration of a child unto the service of Christ? If it doth, as all Christians that understand their Baptism know it doth: then the Defend. hath made a faire distinguishing, to prove that which is in the Abridgment intended, viz. That that which belongeth to Baptism is ascribed to the Crosse.

SECT. VIII. IX.

IN the eight Section there is nothing found, but that which the Defend. himselfe confesseth to be a needlesse repetition

tion of that which hath been formerly handled more then once.

In the ninth it is questioned, *Whether crossing upon the breast (which is the manner of Papists) be not as lawfull, as crossing upon the fore head?* Here 1 the Def. slighteth the Non-conformists, as being unfit Advocates to plead our cause against the Papists. Where, if hee meaneth by our cause, the Ceremonies, and Hierarchicall government, I grant that he saith: and adde also, that all *England* doth not afford Advocates, who can otherwise defend that cause against the Papists, then by pleading that their corruptions are in many respects worse then ours, and that therefore all Arguments which condemn theirs doe not so directly and immediately pertain to ours, though some doe. But if he mean by *our cause*, the common cause of reformed Churches, I doubt not to say (without any detraction from Dr. Morton, who (before he was Bishop) did good service in his kinde this way) that not onely Dr. Fulke Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Whitakers, and such other, no favourers or Patrones of these corruptions, but also M. Cartwright, and also Mr. Bightman, who was one of the Ministers who are thus slighted, were (to say no more) as able Advocates of our cause against the Papists, as any Bishops in England, and so haue declared themselves to be by their learned writings. 2 He giveth this difference, *That our crossing is with words of interpretation: but the Papists, when theyrosse, doe not use to manifest their meaning.* To which I answer, first, that it is therefore the more sacramentall, the word being added unto the outward signe: secondly, that therefore our crosse is not the fathers crosse, who never added any word unto it, as M. Perkins sheweth, *In problem. de sig. crucis*: thirdly, that therefore also it is superfluous, according as the common plea is against images, if they teach not without words added: *Poterit id absque iis commodius fieri: the words can teach better without them*: fourthly, beside, the Papists in divers of their solemn crossings, haue as good declarations of their meaning as we.

In the second place the Defend. granteth that *crossing of breasts where people are fully instructed, cannot bee justly excepted against*: as if the more men were instructed, the more use there were of crosses! Or as if our people generally were fully instructed about the crosse in Baptisme! But what need more words? We see that usuall crossing of any part of the body is now defended, and confessed to be justified by our crossing. Are not the Papists (think you) beholding to our Ceremonies, and their Defenders? Yet (saith the Def.) *it is more sife*
for

for a passenger, to reade Written on a pillar the way he seeketh to find unto some Citie, then to be left unto his own collection out of the pillars placing. True: But if a passenger hath his way written unto any Citie, what helpeth it to have an ill-favored misshapen picture of that Citie, or the way to it pourtrayed upon the pillar? Now this is our case, we have the way to heaven described sufficiently by him that is Light and Truth it selfe: what use then of a dark untoward crosse picture, which cannot be perceived neither, without a prospectiue glasse, which also must be fetched from the Prelats shop. Beside, if a man hath his direction once in writing, a sign may suffice to remember him of it, without any new writing upon it.

SECT. X. XI.

AT length we are come to the originall authour of the Crosse. Wee say that *Valentinus* was the first that any records doe mention, to have advanced, or given credit and honour to the Crosse, *Ir. l. 1. c. 1.* The Defend. answereth, first, that *Ireneus* relating *Valentinus* his heresie, maketh no mention at all, either of the Wood, or of the sign of the Crosse, but onely of the persecution of Christians, for the name of Christ. Which he proveth by two arguments: 1 That Christs Words which *Valentinus* alledged mean nothing else but suffering of persecution: 2 That *Valentinus* maketh his Crosse a fanne, which can signifie nothing else but persecution. Now for the clearing of this point, consider: 1, That this Defend. can bring none more ancient then this blasphemous heretick, *Valentinus*, that maketh any honourable mention of the sign of the Crosse. 2 That this hereticke did ascribe the same vertue to the Crosse which our Prelats doe, viz. that *confirmat & stabilit*, i. confirmeth and stablisheth: it is for constant profession. 3 That he alledgeth the same Scriptures for his crosse, which our Prelats doe or can for theirs. 4 That *Ireneus* affirmeth of the followers of *Valentinus*, *Basilides & Gnostici*, that they used images, pictures and signes of those things which they taught and professed. By these considerations it will appear more then probable, that this devilish heretick was the first advancer of this superstitious sign. 5 Our Writers also who deal with the Papists about this question, are of the same judgment, Dr. *Fulke* against *Bristow* Math. 46, against *Rhem.* Luk. 24, against *Sand.* of *Imag.* c. 13, *Rejoind.* against *Mart.* art. 1, p. 137. art. 4. 161, art. 5. 167, Dr. *Will.* de *cruce*, art. 3. 6 The reasons which the Def. alledgeth to the contrary, are no better then if a man should say, the Popes of Rome

Rome alledge for their Supremacy, *Peters keyes, Peters feeding,* &c. which cannot signifie any such thing as the Popes Supremacie: *ergo*, the Popes of Rome mean nothing lesse, by their supremacie, then an universall Monarchicall power over all the Church of Christ. But (saith the Defend.) *Valentinus maketh no mention, either of the Wood, or of the signe of the Crosse.* No doth? What then is the meaning of these words of his, which *Irenæus* quoteth, *l. 2. c. 42, Ipse habitus crucis fines & summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudinem, & duos in latitudinem, & unum in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur?* that is, *The very habite of the Crosse hath fine ends, or heightes, two in length, two in breadth, and one in the midst, where it resteth, which is fastened with nayles.* Wherout it is apparant, that *Valentinus* did not onely make mention of the figure of the Crosse, but also of such a figure as (being the right by *Irenæus* his approbation) doth shew, that our Crossers both *Poorth*, and *English*, doe but mock the simple people, by telling them that they make the figure of the Crosse, when they doe not make two ends of it long-waies, and two side waies, with one in the midst, but as it pleaseth them to turn their fingers. But yet *Irenæus* (saith our Def.) doth plainly justifie the sayings of *Valentinus* concerning the crosse, calling them *bene dicta*: 1 Well sayd. What should a man say to this perversenesse? *Irenæus* acknowledgeth the words of Scripture, which the vile heretick applied unto his crosse, to be good sayings, but ill applyed: therefore *Irenæus* justified the sayings of the heretick. As if all Christians that confesse the Scriptures to be true, which Papists apply to their abominations, did therefore justifie the abominations of Papists. Where was conscience, or consideration, when such reasons as these, did fall from *D. Mortons* penne?

SECT. XII.

IT is alledged also out of the Centurists, that *Montanus* a grand heretick, was the first countenancer of the signe of the Crosse among Christians, as may probably be gathered out of *Tertul. de coron. milit. c. 3. & 4*, to which the Def. answereth two things; 1 That *Tertullian* there maketh mention of other ceremonies used before *Montanus* was born: 2 That whosoever was the father of the Crosse, the mother certainly was an honest woman, viz. the ancient Church of Christ; and that is sufficient for us to know. To the first of which I reply: 1 That though some other Ceremonies, more ancient, be mentioned; yet *Montanus* may be the first countenancer of this. For hereticks used

to reteyn some old things, that they may more easily bring in their own additions. 2 It is not denyed neither, but that the Crosse was more ancient then *Montanus*: for *Valentinus* (as formerly was alledged) made much account of it. But *Montanus* was an heretick farre more crafty then *Valentine*, and so could better promote the credit of such a rite in the Church then the other. 3 The Defendant can shew no honourable mention of the Crosse in any Author, more ancient then *Tertullian*, who at this time when he spake of it, was a disciple of the heretick *Montanus*, except it be *Valentinus*, of whom he is ashamed. 4 Not onely Mr. Hy. and the Centurie-writers, but also many other of our Divines, doe giue this credit unto *Montanus*, viz. *Hamelman*, *Crispin*, *Chemnitius*, Mr. *Dearing*, Dr. *Whitakers*, Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *Sutcliffe*, and Mr. *Perkins*, as Mr. *Parker* sheweth, Part. 2. p. 229.

Now to the second answer, that the ancient Church was an honest mother of the Crosse. I haue this to say: 1 That shee was too honest to be so abused by the bringers in of such superstitions, whosoever they were. 2 That the chaste Spouse of Christ was no mother of any crosse untill shee had lost something of her first loue, *Rev. 2. 4.* and that such garments as the Crosse is, was part of her light wantonnesse wherewith she began afterward to discredit her chaste Virginitie. 3 That the mothering of mysticall Ceremonies upon the ancient Church, is no sufficient plea for them: because, she ought to be no mother of any children, saue onely those which are begotten by the immortall seed of the Word of God, *1 Pet. 1. 23.*

SECT. XIII.

Our Canons also confesse, that it is the meaning of the Church of England, that the crosse should be esteemed and used with us, as it was by the fathers of the Primitive Church: and it is well known, that sundry of them put great holiness in it, and wrot of it very superstitiously, abusing it as superstitiously as the rankest Papists, saving that they did not bestow divine worship upon it. To this the Defend. answereth, 1 That it is all one to say that the fathers abused the crosse as superstitiously as the rankest Papists, saving that they did not bestow divine worship upon it: as if he should accuse one to bee as ranke a traytor as any rebell, saving that he acknowledgeth his due obedience unto the King. Wherin this audacious Defend. doubteth not to defend all the uses or abuses of the crosse among Papists, saving onely that they bestow Diuine worship upon it. For men therefore in a religious opinion

to crosse themselves, at their going forth, their comming in, their lying down, their rising up, when they wash or sit, when they cloath or uncloath; with the crosse also to consecrate the water of Baptism, and the Lords Bodie in the Supper, holding it necessary to the being of a Sacrament; nay, to use it for conjuring of devils, and working of miracles, with such other pretty tricks; all this, I say now, in our Convocations and Defendants judgement, are found lawfull, and free from all superstition. What then should I write upon their dores, but *Lord haue mercy upon them?*

2 In the next place it is answered by the Def. that our principall Divines, *Chemnitius, Zanchie, Martyr, Jewel, Zepperus, and Perkins*, haue justified the ancient Churches in the use of the crosse. But first of all, whatsoever in any of our judicious and sincere Divines is found that soundeth any way to the favouring of the fathers crosse, it is spoken in comparison of the Papists crosse: so that for a man to conclude thus, our Divines say, that the fathers crosse was better then the Papists, therefore it was good: is all one, as to say, that it is good to meet a bear robbed of her whelpes; because Solomon saith, that that is bitter then to meet a fool in his folly. Secondly, if some of our Divines, in excuse of the fathers practise, haue used very favourable words, this is not sufficient for the Convocations allowance, or for the Defendants alledging of them, as approving all that the Papists doe with their crosses, saving their worshipping of them. Thirdly, for the Divines alledged, though *Chemnitius* did sometime speak too sparingly against images, as is to be seen in his common-places upon the first commandement; yet there is nothing here alledged out of him by the Defendant, which can justify all the Fathers use of crosses. And as for the collection which the Defend. maketh out of his words, viz. that there cannot bee the like superstition in the crosse transient, which there may be in the permanent, it is evidently false. For the Papists, *Swarez, Bellarmine*, and others, doe expressly confesse, that the transient crosse is and ought to be worshipped, as well and as highly as the permanent: and the transient aeriall crosse, is alwaies at hand, like a pickpurse, or a familiar spirit to serue all superstitious turnes. *Zanchie* is much abused by the Defend. for hee, in the place alledged, *de Redemp. p. 366*, sheweth plainly, that he did not approue of the Fathers crossing. For first, he saith, that those things, which are read in the Fathers about it, they are not, *usque adeo mala; so euill altogether as the Papists practise*. Secondly, of those crossings which he calleth tolerable, and laudable; he addeth. *a quibus in presentia abstinendum omnino est:*

We must now altogether abstain from them, and that now after Popish abuse they are to be taken away according to the example of *Hezekiah*. Thirdly, he is bold to affirme, that one cause which moved the Fathers to crosse themselves, was *κακοζηλῶ* an unwarrantable affection of imitating the Jewes: Yea, that Constantines own practise about the crosse cannot wholly be approved. Peter Martyr hath the very same words with Zanchie: viz. that one cause of the fathers crossing was their *κακοζηλῶ* mimickall following of the Jewes, *Loc. com. p. 22.* Zepperus saith plainly, not onely of the Crosse, but also of all such Ceremonies added by men unto the Sacraments, that they are the seed of idolatry and superstition, *l. 1. c. 10.* Mr. Perkins was not afraid to affirm, that *Veteres signo crucis muniri animam dicebant, vel ex sententia Montani, vel dubitanter: The ancient Fathers used the crosse, either in the sense which Montanus an heretick brought in; or else doubtfully, Probl. de cruce.*

SECT. XIII.

FOR confutation of us about the crosse, our Def. hath nothing to bring, but the judgment of Bishop Jewel, who though he was a Jewell indeed among many others most orient, yet was hee a Bishop, and an English Bishop. What a poor confutation is this? If he could notwithstanding shew, that even B. Jewel commended this ceremonie, or urged it unto the silencing of Gods Ministers for not conforming unto it, then the alledging of his authority might be pardoned in a cause that is forsaken of better proofes. But even B. Jewel, is brought in heer speaking nothing to our question: 1 Hee approveth (saith the Def.) of the sign of the crosse, as it is a significant token in banners; but you will not abide it in baptism. A goodly consequence: whatsoever is tolerable in Souldiers flagges, or colours, that is good to be used in Baptisme. 2 Hee alloweth the ancient use of it in Baptisme, notwithstanding the Romish abuse therof: but you would have it for that cause abolished. Which is neither so, nor so: For he hath not one word of Baptisme; nor of allowance (even out of Baptisme) in religious worship: and if he had, yet the Defend. might consider, that *Hezekia* was in the same heresie with us in this difference: for hee allowed of the ancient use of the brazen serpent, before it was made an idoll, but not after. 3 Hee bringeth in the consent of holy men, who undergoing the morall crosse, were witnesses allowing the ceremoniall crosse. No such thing at all, God be thanked (saith Jewel) that we cannot onely abide the signe of the crosse, but also
take

take up our crosse and follow Christ. : vvvhich words in good sence and good conscience, we can oppose to our Bishops imputations, as he did to *Hardings*. 4. *All this was admitted When the abuse was at the highest* : so could Paul abide the badge of *Caster* and *Pollux* in a civill use, when the abuse was at the highest, *Act. 28. 11.* as we can the badge of the crosse upon silver and gold, if our Prelats would suffer us to handle any. Is it not a proper conclusion, think you, which the Defendant can draw out of these premises?

CHAP. III. SECT. I. II. III.

IN the two former chapters wee haue found but very few particulars about the Crosse and Surplice which were not sufficiently debated in the generall part, as in their proper place : but *kneeling at the communion* hath many considerations proper to it selfe, and therefore more heed is to be given unto the defence which is made for it,

In the two first sections there is onely a prologue wherein the Defendant hath nothing materiall, or worthy of examination. In the third, he bringeth in a naked argument *from Christs example, Who did sit at the table*, taken out of the Abridgement, p. 56. 57. and giveth as naked an answer thereto, viz. *Christs example doth not inferre a necessitie of the imitation thereof*. But if the reader doth but look upon the Abridgement, hee shall finde this arrow headed after another manner, and shot out of another bow. For there 1. it is alledged, that *there is no direction in the whole Scripture, either by precept or commended example, for receiving any sacrament kneeling, whereas for receiving with other gestures, there is both*. 2. *That at the first institution it was not received kneeling by Christ and his Apostles*. 3. *That it is grosse hypocrisie for us to pretend more holinesse, reverence, and devotion in the receiving of it, then was in them*. 4. *That we are bound to imitate Christ, and the commended examples of his Apostles in all things, wherein it is not evident, that they had speciall reasons moving them thereto, that doe not concerne us*, Eph. 5. 1. 1. Cor. 11. 1. 1. Thess. 1. 6. Phil. 3. 17. 2 Thess. 3. 17. 5. *That there can be no good reason given, why it should not be as fit and necessarie for the Apostles to receiue kneeling, as for us, but rather more fit for them, because of Christs corporall presence*. 6. *the consent of Calvin, Bullinger, Keckerman, Beza, Chemnitius, Bucanus, Sutcliffe, and Willet is brought in as using and allowing this argument taken from Christs example*. Let any man compare this argument with that which the Defendant ci-

teth, and they will not seeme the same : or vvith his answer, and it vvill appeare (as it is) meere nothing.

SECT. IIII. V. VI. VII. VIII.

IN stead of a direct answer therefore we haue a confutation, or a prooffe of the contrary : vvhich is such a kind of disputing as some unskillfull shufflers use, vvho vvhen they cannot answer an argument, doe the best they can *to crosse it with another*. Now in this confutation first sect. 4. hee vvould seeme to take some advantage in the greek vvord *δίσκωτο, ἀνακλιπόμενος*, which Calvin and Beza render by [*discumbere*] and may be well turned *lying downe* : vvhich is nothing else but a vaine flourish. For all know, that these vvords do note, as in other authors, so in scripture, a table gesture, and some kind of sitting, *Math. 9. Mark. 2. &c.* Neither is there any Grammer Scholler but can, out of his Dictionarie at least, tell, that *discumbere* doth usually signifie sitting at the table, and not lying downe : and therefore it vvvas marvellous idle for the Defendant to cite *Baronius* as thinking that Christ and his Apostles *discubuerunt lectis*, that is, *did sit upon beds* : for of beds there is no question ; and *discumbere, accumbere, recumbere*, vvhen they are applied to such beds as vvvere then used in bankets for seats, doe not signifie *procumbere*, lying along, but the table gesture of sitting vvhich then vvvas in use. Our last Translators (or their reuizers) though they took some advantage, in many places, to put *hell* into the text in stead of the *grauē*, for maintenance of discent into hell : and haue made *Iudas a Bishop*, *Act. 1. 20.* for the credit of Bishops ; and haue patched vvithout reason, *helpes in governments*, *1. Cor. 12. 28.* for to keep Elders out of office in the Church : although (I say) these men vvvere so bold in some such vvords and phrales, as to wrest them to their purpose, yet in the gesture of Christ and his Apostles at the Lords supper, the case is so cleare, they durst not speak of *lying downe, falling downe, or laying downe*, as this Defendant doth, but alvvayes tell us that they did sit. In the second place the Defendant granteth that *We may not deny our Saviours and his Apostles gesture, to haue been a kind of sitting* : vvhich he repeateth ageine sect. 7. vvherein 1. his ingenuitie is to bee commended aboue the audaciousnesse of his brother *Iohn Bishop of Rochester*, vvho in his discourse of kneeling, p. 126. affirmeth it to be very uncertaine vvwhether Christ and his Apostles did sit or no at the celebration of the communion : and p. 147, avoucheth it more probable that they did not sit ; though hee confesseth that they did sit at the paschall or vvlgar Supper :
though

though both *Matthew* and *Mark* say, that the supper was administered *as they did eat*: and *Rochester* himselfe bringeth in *Theophilact* affirming that Christ did sit after the ordinary manner of feasts in celebrating of his owne supper, vvhathsoever he did in the other, p. 133. 134. 2. He sheweth plainly that his former descanting upon the Greek and Latine vvords, vvas but vaine flourish. But yet (sayth he) *the Evangelists leaue it uncertaine whether this sitting was upright or somewhat leaning, and therefore it was not intended that this gesture should be an exact paterne of imitation to be continued in the Church.* Which is as good reason as if one should say, the Disciples took the bread and the cup into their hands, but it is uncertaine vvwhether they took it with two fingers, or with three, or more, and therefore it vvas not intended, that this act of taking should be an exact paterne of imitation to be continued in the Church: vvwhich yet the Defendant himselfe maintaineth, s. 8. against the Papists. A second reason of confutation is brought in the sixth section, *because other circumstances are not to be imitated, as the number of communicants, their sex, the place, and time which was used in the first institution.* To which I answer, 1. That in the very argument as it is propounded in the Abridgment, this objection is prevented: for there it is sayd, that Christs example is to be imitated in those things for which there was not *speciall reason* at that time. For as it is a received rule of Divinitie, the good actions even of godly men, recorded in the scripture, where they had not speciall reason, are set forth for examples of generall imitation: so much more in the institution of this sacrament by Christ himselfe, we are, with that limitation to take up our paterne as well as our precept. Now every one of understanding may see, that there was speciall reason for number, sexe, place, and time, as the Defendant himselfe teacheth in the 8. section; but none can be shewed for sitting. 2. A manifest difference doth evidently appeare even by this, that whereas many reverend Divines, and whole Churches defend sitting, as appointed for imitation, none are so simple as to affirme the same of the other circumstances.

In the sixth section it is alledged for another confutation, that *our own witnesses hold that we are not bound to imitate Christ in unleavened bread, and in the mixture of water with wine.* To which I answer, 1. that the same witnesses do shew, there was speciall reason for unleavened bread, viz. because there was no other to be had at the time of the passover. And for mixture of water they speak of it only by conjecture. There is no likenesse therefore betwixt these and sitting. The Defendant himselfe confesseth as much in the eighth section.

In

In the seventh section, for further confutation, he objecteth our owne practise, viz. *that we walk from person to person, in delivering of these holy rites, whereas Christ did it sitting.* To which I answer, 1. We doe not use to walke thus, where we may use the libertie which Christ hath given us: for we hold sitting of minister and people together at the table, to be more agreeable to Christs institution. When by force wherewith *Caistane*, a Cardinall of Rome, would not (as we heard afore) oppresse us as the Prelates doe, we are hindered from practising that we desire, we can doe no better (if wee communicate at all at this time) then to come as neere it as we can, abstaining in the mean time from that which is evill. 2 Walking or standing are more agreeable to a Supper then kneeling. 3 They were never so abused unto idolatry in the sacrament, as kneeling hath been.

In the eight section, for an accurate determination of this first poynt, a distinction is propounded betwixt occasionall or accidentall and sacramentall, or essentiall acts of Christ in the institution of this sacrament. The distinction I allow: and cannot but pittie the Defendant, in that he could make no application of it to the gesture of sitting. He telleth us the occasion of many other circumstances, but sheweth none of this: and therefore sufficiently confuteth the comparisons which formerly hee made betwixt them and this. The reformed Churches of strangers which were in England in King *Edwards* dayes, make *accubitus ad mensam Dominicam*: that is, *sitting at the Lords table*, a sacramentall part of the institution, as appeareth in *Iohannes à Lasco* his description of their Ecclesiasticall orders, p. 206. *accubitus ad mensam Domini est pars signi cene Dominice*: that is, *sitting at the table of the Lord is a part of the signe of the Lords supper.* And with them consented then, the best Protestants among the English, as appeareth in the Preface of that book.

As for that application of the former distinction, which the Defendant here by way of digression, maketh against the Papists, it serveth onely to shew, how well he could plead in a good cause, if he had such a one in hand: but bewrayeth withall the miserie of his defence in this cause: for which he could find no colour at all in the vvords or acts of our Saviour at the institution. Now well fare *Iohn* of Rochester, vvho dares insinuate unto his reader, that for ought appeareth in the text, Christ or his Apostles at the least did kneele at the time of receiving.

SECT. IX. X. XI. XII. XIII. XIII. XV. XVI. XVII.

THE Arguments in these passages propounded against kneeling, are stiled by the Defendant, *Pretences*: but upon examination of his answers given unto them, it will appear how he hath misplaced that name, vvhich properly belongeth unto his vaine defences.

The first reason is (sect. 9.) taken out of the Abridgement, p. 61. vvhich it is thus expressed: *The gesture of kneeling in receiuing the bread and wine, holds no proportion with the chiefe end and use of this sacrament, nor with that inward disposition of heart, which is then required of us. For Christ ordained it to be a banquet, and sacrament, of that sweet familiaritie that is between the faithfull and him, and of that spirituall nourishment wee are to receiue by feeding on his body and blood by faith. And in what nation was it ever held comely to kneele at their bankets, or to receiue their food kneeling? Piscator alledgeth this for the reason why our Saviour and his disciples receiued sitting, and holds it a good argument against the Masse, that it hath no shew or resemblance of a banquet in Math. 26. So also D. Sutcliffe in Mistra, f. 298. and the disposition of heart that is required of us in the very act of receiuing, is not so much humilitie as assurance of faith, and cheerefull thankfulness, which is much better expressed and stirred up by the gesture of standing, then of kneeling.* I haue set downe these words at large, because the Abridgement is chiefly and most professedly opposed in this defence. And the other phrases which he seemeth to cite out of a dispute, and Mr. Lang his conference, are here briefly explained. Now let us heare his defence: First, he sayth, *This banquet is not a corporall, but a mysticall banquet, and therefore the form and fashion of an ordinary banquet is not to be required in it, as talking, eating, drinking, inviting and pledging.* Wherein 1. he sayth nothing at all to the purpose: for this reason was not brought in directly to inferre all the fashions of an ordinary banquet, but to remoue that fashion of kneeling, which doth not agree to any banquet, ether ordinary or extraordinary. 2. It is false that he saith, there is no corporall banquet in the Lords Supper: for as there is a bodily washing in baptisme, so also a corporall banquet in the Lords Supper, though a further matter be intended. 3. The mysticall banquet of this sacrament doth not take away but establish the corporall: for therefore is the banquet mysticall, because by, and with the banquet of our bodies, there is a secret spirituall banquet exhibited unto our soules. 4. Though all fashions of a banquet may not here be

F

used,

used, yet those which may be iustified by Christs owne example ought not to be excluded. 3 The very fashions which here he nameth, *talking, eating, drinking, inviting and pledging*, in a graue religious manner being limited by the holinesse of the action, are very good: as when the minister speaketh to the communicants, they eat and drink, being invited by the minister, and taking the cup one out of anothers hand, doe in some manner pledge one another. This reaching of the bread and wine from one to another, ought not to seeme strange unto our English Bishops, seeing it is not onely warranted by those words of our Saviour, *Divide it among you, Luk 22. 17.* but acknowledged by a Bishop and Cardinall of Rome, Caietane by name, in *Math. 26. Sicut calicem unus discipulus dedit alij, ita patinam cum pane sin-* Et propinquiores Iesu, remotioribus successive porrexerunt, that is, *As one Disciple gaue the cup to an other, so those who were neerer to Iesus, reached the dish with the holy bread, successiue to those who were further off:* So that if this Cardinall of Rome were aliue againe, and were a Diocesan Bishop in England, the Ministers in his Diocesse might haue more liberty to follow the Apostles example in the celebration of the Lords supper, then either they or the communicants can enioy under the Lordly usurping Prelats in England at this day: at least in this point.

In the second place he speaketh of *horror*, in that some of our Writers doe mention *familiaritie* with Christ, and hold it decent for adopted coheires with Christ to kneele at the sacrament. So doe the Papists also think strange, that we should be so *familiar* with Christ, as to come unto him without mediation of Saints: and it is arrogant presumption in their eyes for a faithfull man to professe assurance of grace and salvation. But the horror will soone be over, if the words of the Abridgement (formerly cited) be looked upon, whereby the meaning of these phrases is cleared, viz. that our blessed Saviour in this Supper vouchsafeth to call the faithfull unto a sweet familiaritie with himselfe, and this is to be represented in the maner of celebrating the same: so that howsoever, in other actions, other gestures are more fitting; yet in the very action of receiving, none so convenient as that which expresseth this high advancement whereunto we are called.

For removing of that answer, the Def. pleadeth in the tenth section, 1. that *though in Scripture the communion of Saints in heaven be shadowed out by the similitude of a Supper, wherein the faithfull shall sit, eat, and drink with Christ in his kingdome, yet no ancient learning ever taught that the Supper of the Eucharist was propounded to be an expresse and proper type and similitude of the heavenly.* To which

which I reply, 1 If he meane by ancient learning, the testimonies of men that lived in former ages, his argument is old, unprofitable, and dead. For Cardinall Caietane himselfe can tell him, that *Deus non alligavit expositionem sacrarum scripturarum priscorum doctorum sensibus, sed scriptura ipsa sub Ecclesie Catholica censura, alioquin spes nobis ac posteris tolleretur exponendi scripturam sacram, nisi transferendo (ut aiunt) de libro in quinternium pref. in quinque libr. Moysi*, that is, in interpreting of scripture we are not tied to the ancient learning of men, but to the scripture it selfe. 2 By that which the Defendant confesseth, it is very probable, at the least, that the supper instituted by Christ, is a proper type of the heavenly supper. For seeing a supper is a fit resemblance of that happinesse, and so often used in scripture even by our Saviour him selfe for the shadowing of it, and the instituted supper is a type, why should we not take it for a type of that which is so fitly resembled by it? It is a rule of interpreting scripture, that where no reason doth constreine, we are not to restraine the sence, but take the words in the largest signification. And is not the same rule to be followed in explaining of sacraments, which are visible words? 3 Our Saviour him selfe doth expressly lead his Disciples from that instituted Supper unto the heavenly *Math. 26. 29. I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, untill that day, when I shall drink it new with you in my fathers kingdome*. Which words were spoken at the time of the Supper, and cannot be meant of that occasional drinking with some of the Disciples recorded of our Saviour after his resurrection: because this was a promise made to all: it was of a new wine: and was to be in his fathers kingdome at that day. 4 For ancient learning of men, *Augustine*, and *Hilarie* doe so interpret that place: and *Thomas Aquinas* also alloweth of their judgement, when he citeth them in *catena aurea*. 5. This learning, at least, is as ancient as the reformation of religion in England: for these are the words of *Iohannes à Lasco*, speaking in the name of whole Churches in King Edwards dayes: *Accubitus seu confessus convivium ad mensam Dominicam designat etiam nobis gloriam ac dignitatem nostram, quam in regno Dei olim habituri sumus; nempe quod quemadmodum Christus Dominus conviviali nos ad mensam suam in cœna sua accubitu (sub persona suorum Apostolorum) dignatus est: ita & in regno olim Dei, æterno illi deum beatoque convivio, ut cœlestes convivæ adhibendi simus, ut ad æternam divinæ gloriæ fruitionem una cum Abrahamo, Isaaco, & Iacobo, tandem accumbamus, inque æterna deinceps regni Dei felicitate considereamus: that is, The sitting together of guests at the Lords table, signifieth to us also our glory and dignitie, which we are one day to have in the kingdome of*

God; to wit, that as Christ the Lord hath vouchsafed us, under the person of his Apostles, such a sitting as is usuall at a feast, at his table, at his supper: so also wee shall one day in the kingdome of God bee admitted as heavenly guests to that everlasting and blessed banquet: that wee may at the length sit downe with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to the eternall enjoying of Gods glory, and may for ever after ward sit still in the endlesse happinesse of Gods Kingdome. *Forma Eccles. minist. pag. 221.*

But the Defend. will proue the contrary by reason grounded on Scripture. *The immediate mysticall object of this Supper* (saith he) *is the body and blood as crucified and shed. The end is, the remembrance onely of things past, beere is no type of celestiaall joy.* Where (to passe by his new terme, *object of the Supper*) I would know of him: 1 if onely the Bodie and blood of Christ bee represented in the Sacrament, and not also the vertues and benefits which come unto us, by being partakers of them? 2 If the vertue of them be restrained onely to this life? 3 If the whole communion which we haue, and hope to haue with Christ, be not there represented, as *Paul* teacheth, 1 Cor. 10. 16? 4 If in this communion there be nothing pertaining to celestiaall joy? 5 If the Pascheover did not signifie something past, as the deliverance out of *Aegypt*; something present, as communion of grace; and something to come, as the Lamb that should take away the finnes of the world? If it was not so in Circumcision, and also in Baptisme? If so, why not also in the Lords Supper?

He further disputeth: *Signes and types are resemblances of immediate objects, and not of remote and consecratorie. As Baptisme is a sign of regeneration, but not of the Kingdom of glorie wherinto we enter by regeneration: so the bread and wine are onely signes, representing unto us the Body and Blood.* It is a strange humour in this Bishop: when he interpreteth Scripture, or rather wresteth it for the authority of Bishops, then he giveth it a larger sense then any reason will suffer: as, *Let all things be done in order: that is, saith he, and his consorts. Let mysticall Ceremonies (Crosse, Surplice &c.) be appointed by Bishops, as occasion shall serue. Let Arch bishops, Arch deacons, Chancellors, Officialls, Commissaries, Spirituall Courts be erected in such manner as they are in England.* But when the same man commeth to explain unto us the Lords Institutions, they must haue more straight limits then the very words of holy Scripture can be contained in. We heard before how this Defend. limited the second Commandement; and now he attempteth the like about the Sacraments: as if he were interpreting penall statutes of men, of which

it

it is said, *Odis sunt restringenda; quibus amores sunt ampliandi*: that is, *Odious, or hatefull things are to be restrained, though fauours be to be indulged*. Doth Baptism signifie nothing but that new birth, whereby we haue entrance into the Kingdome of grace? Doth it not represent unto us that perfect washing and cleansing also which is the state of a glorious Church? So the holy Communion, doth it onely represent the imperfect communion we haue with Christ heere, and not the fulnesse of it which is reserved for hereafter? The Scripture speaketh otherwise, *Ephes. 5.26.27*. As for *objects immediate, remote, and consecratorie*, I know not well the meaning of these termes in this place. If he had expounded them, I would haue shewed my opinion of them more fully. In briebe thus. All consecratories, or things that doe follow upon communion with Christ, are not, neither can be properly represented in the Sacrament of the communion: though they be all sealed up to the faithfull: Yet all parts, degrees, and circumstances of our communion with Christ, which may be shadowed out by those outward elements and actions which are used in this Sacrament, are by the same represented. For God will haue his signes to be as significant as their nature will beare. *Immediate* and *remote* make no such difference, as that one should be excluded, if the other be admitted.

In the 11 Section, another objection is brought in, to the same purpose with the former, *viz. That the Supper is placed upon a Table, 1 Cor. 10. 21, wherein is a resemblance of heavenly societie, and therefore a Table-gesture is to be used, &c.* Vpon this occasion, the Defend. taketh upon him to pose us from point to point: asking, first; *If the ground would not serue for a Table, when no artificiall table can be gotten? And secondly, if it be not impossible to prepare one table, whereat all the Communicants may sit jointly together?* Surely, this positing hath no great difficulty in it. For the first, I say, it is an extraordinary case, such as is the state of them which get no wine, but are forced to use that liquour which to them in other usage is in stead of vvine. In Izeland also they haue no bread made of corne: and yet they haue the communion among them, with such bread as the Country affoordeth. This therefore maketh no more against the resemblance of a table, then against the signification of bread and wine. Yet an artificiall Table may be prepared in a wilderness, though it be but of Turfes or Earth. The second question is a meer cavillation. For we doe not hold it necessary, that all the Communicants doe sit joyntly together at one table; but successiuelly at the least, as is practised in Scotland

and the Low Countries. 2 He telleth us, that *by the Table of divels*, 1 Cor. 10. 21, is meant an Altar. Which if it be so, maketh nothing to the purpose; except he will say also, with the Papists, that by the Table of the Lord is meant in the same place an Altar. But the assertion it selfe is false, as Morney sheweth against the Papists, *De Eucharist. l. 3. c. 3.*

3 Hee asketh (by the way) *What person it was that Christ did sustaine at the celebration of his Supper, whether of a Lord, or else of a servant?* To which I answer, that the disjunction is idle. For hee sustained the person of a Lord in instituting of this Sacrament, and yet withall, he sustained the person of a Minister, in administering of it. Dare any ordinary Minister, or Bishop either, say in his own name, *Doe this in remembrance of mee?*

But I trust (saith the Defend.) *that you dare not affirme, that Christ in his ministration of this Supper of grace, was a type and figure of himselfe, in the state of his Covenantship, which is in his Kingdom: for so shall you confound things infinitely distant, ministration and dominion: estate militant and triumphant; Lord and servant, earth and heaven.* Alas, good man, these are but great words, which may passe for currant in popular declamations before the ignorant. We know better; viz. that to make one thing a representation of another, is not to confound them, but by relation to conjoyn them. We dare affirm that the honour which was done unto Christ lying in the Manger, was a representation of that honour which now is done unto him in heaven by men and Angels. We dare affirme that the prayers which Christ made for his Disciples upon the earth, were a representation of that intercession which now he maketh for all the faithfull in heaven. Nay, we dare yet be more bold, and say, that an ordinary Minister, in the administration of the Word and Sacraments, on earth, doth represent the person of Christ in heaven. And yet in all this there is no confounding of earth and heaven.

Another reason is alledged out of the Abridgment, in the 12 Sect. viz. *that the disposition of heart which is required of us in the very act of receiving, is not so much humility, as assurance of faith and cheerfulness: which is much better expressed and shewed by the gesture of sitting then of kneeling.* Where, though he hath changed some words of the Abridgment, as *standing into sitting*, and *stirred up into shewed*, yet I will not stand upon that: let us hear his answer.

1 Humility (saith he) *doth not hinder the assurance of faith.* True, but an apt solempne expression of humility in particular, doth

doth for that moment hinder or exclude an apt solemn expression of faith and cheerfull thankfulness: even as words solemnly and professedly expressing humility, doe for that moment hinder the same man from expressing by words his faithfull and cheerfull thanksgiving.

2 He asketh, *Who make us Vshers at this feast?* No man surely, neither doe we take that office upon us: and therefore we desire to follow the direction and example of Christ, who was the onely Master of this feast. But our Lord Bishops, being used to haue Gentlemen Vshers under them at their feasts, and ordinarie meales also, think they may take upon them at their own pleasure, to usher and manage our Lords feast, though it be contrary to his direction: which insolencie of theirs, wee cannot consent unto. This is the very state of the question betwixt them and us about this matter.

3 Hee telleth us of diuers examples: 1 *Wherin faith and humility doe agree, Mat. 8. 8,* which is a thing that we never doubted of. 2 *Wherein humiliation and thankfulness agreed in the gesture of kneeling, Ps. 95. 2. 6.* Which we deny not neither in prayer, whether it be petition or thanksgiving: But the outward acting of thankfulness in such a businesse where prayer, for that moment, hath no place, is of another nature. 3 *Wherin men and Angels praise God upon their knees, Apoc. 5. 7, & 7. 11,* where a gesture of prayer also is expressed. But he doth not in the mean time obserue, that *Ap. 7. 9,* where the same thankfulness is expressed out of a forme of prayer by the gesture of standing. Neither doth he giue any answer unto that which is cited in the Abridgement to this purpose, out of *1 King. 8. 54,* and out of *Hospinian, Rupertus, and Zanchius, p. 67.*

In the 13 Sect. certain words are alledged out of the Abridgement, p. 67, which there make one answer of five, unto an objection of the aduersaries about kneeling to the Sacrament it selfe: but here is made a distinct reason by it selfe. So it pleaseth this Defend, to deal with the Ministers arguments, as the Bishops doe with the Ministers themselues, viz. to place, displace, and alter them as they please. The words are these: *If our Saviour had intended that the outward elements should haue been thus revered. hee would not haue made choice of bread and wine, which are so common and base.* To this the Defend. saith, that for the preventing of which, he forced the words to come in here out of place: viz. 1 *That he blusheth in the Ministers behalfe, to hear such Turkish and Heathenish language, proceed from any professor of Christianity, as to call the Sacraments of bread and wine base.* But when he hath well considered the matter, hee may see

see cause enough to blush in his owne behalfe, in that hee hath thus broken out into such intemperate a rage, without any cause or occasion given at all. For 1. hee seeth in the sentence there is mention made of *choyce*, which implieth a comparison: Now what heathenish or Turkish language is this to call bread and wine, common, and base, that is, mean in comparison of some other creatures which God hath made, or might have made, if it had pleased him? 2. With what conscience doth he (to give colour unto his cavill) change the words and meaning of the ministers? They speak of bread and wine chosen to bee made a sacrament: he will have them to speake of bread and wine as they are now sacraments, even in that formall consideration. 3. Our Saviour himselfe sayth as much of bread and wine as this commeth to, when he calleth them perishing things, which goe into the belly, and are cast out into the draught, *Iob. 6. 27. Math. 15. 17.* 4. In respect of worship, and unto the worshippers of the sacraments, it is no more offence to call sacraments base, then to call the blessed Saints dead men; which yet D. Abbot defendeth against such out cries as these used by Bishop, pref. Nay, then it was for *Hizkiab* to call the brazen serpent, even after it had been a great Sacrament, *Nebishtan* that is, a peece of brasse, *2. King. 18. 4.* 2. He telleth us that *S. Peter* would not call ordinary meats common, *Act. 10. 15.* Where he may blush againe in the middest of such a zealous outcry as he seemeth to make, thus to play the Sophister: for he may see in the fourteenth verse of the same chapter, and chapter 11. 8. that by *common* there is meant *polluted*, not to be touched, or eaten: and hee cannot bee so blinded with passion, as to thinke the ministers accounted bread and wine unlawfull to be eaten and drunken.

In the 14. section the Defendant runneth back againe unto the 56 page of the Abridgement, and thereout fetcheth another sentence to deale withall; which is this, *It were great hypocrisie in us, to pretend greater reverence and devotion, in receiving of the sacrament, then was in the Apostles. Nay, if it were fit for us, to use kneeling, it was much more fit for the Apostles, in regard of Christs corporall presence among them.*

Here are two sentences coupled together, which in the Abridgement have substantiall reasons running betwixt them. To those reasons nothing is sayd. To the former sentence, or part of the sentence, silence is used: so that our Convocation men are granted to be guiltie of grosse hypocrisie in urging of kneeling as they doe: onely the latter consequence is denied, viz. that *if it were fit for us to use kneeling, it was much more fit for the*
the

the Apostles. This is denyed in two respects : let us see their weight.

The first respect is : Because then Christs purpose was to make himselfe familiar with his Disciples ; but after his ascension, the precept was laid upon all, that all knees should bow unto him, Phil. 2. 10, Which gesture could not formerly be performed at the sight of his corporall presence, except they should haue been alwaies kneeling.

1 Heer are many words to no purpose: For they doe not hang together in logicall sense. What discretion is in this axiome, *Then hee made himselfe familiar: but after there was a precept to bow unto him.* I hope these two may and did stand together in Christ, viz. that at the same time when he made himselfe, after a sort familiar, there was a precept to worship him. Or else, what meanes this place of Scripture, *Heb. 1. 6, When he bringeth in his first begotten Sonne into the world, he saith, and let all the Angels of God worship him?* 2 It is not affirmed, that the Disciples should alwaies haue kneeled at his corporall presence: but that having the same Sacrament that we haue, and having Christ himselfe present to administer it, unto whom that worship might haue been rightly referred, they had greater reason then we in that respect to kneel.

His second respect is, that *the Apostles were choice and immediate Embassadors of Christ ; but we are exceedingly inferiour unto them.* What should one say to such an earthly conceit? Were not the Apostles as forward in all observance of Christ, as any of the meanest Christians? Did they stand upon their dignity, who confessed themselves to be *earthen vessels, and nothing?* Now certainly, there is cause for some body to blush in the Defendants behalfe, who blushed before for others without cause. I dare say, the best friends he hath in England will be ashamed of this reason when they weigh it. It smelleth of a Lordly humour, wherby our Bishops, according to our proverb, *Muse as they use.*

In the third place, he triflingly observeth, that *the Apostles (so farre as hee remembreth) did never kneele precisely unto Christ : and therefore by our learning we ought not to kneele in our ordinarie prayers. Wherupon he cryeth out of madnesse.* Here, first, he taketh for granted, that it is our learning, that we ought to doe nothing at all, upon any occasion, which we doe not finde the Apostles to haue done precisely, even before the Ascension. Upon what ground he buildeth this I know not, nor yet himselfe, I dare say. Secondly, he denyeth any example to be recorded of the Apostles precise kneeling unto Christ. Wheras, if prostrating the body be precise kneeling, as hee himselfe

taketh it to be, Sect. 12, then we haue examples recorded, *Luk. 5.8, Matb. 14.33, &c.* What sobernesse then is this, for him upon a meer feigned occasion, without any reason, to speak of madnesse?

In the fifteenth Section there is nothing but words the second time repeated.

In the sixteenth, two testimonies of *Zinchie* and *Beza* are brought in at large, witnessing nothing at all, either of sitting or kneeling, or any way to the purpose.

In the seventeenth, we are urged with this question, *How we can allow of standing, if sitting be prescribed?* Our answer is ready: we allow of standing as better then kneeling; but simply of sitting, and that at the Table.

SECT. XVIII.

After pretences, the Defend. commeth to a third accusation, which is Abridg. p. 58, that *the primitive Churches for sundry hundred yeares after the Apostles, never used to receive the Sacrament kneeling, &c.* which consideration being added unto the former, viz. that neither Christ, nor his Apostles did so, nor the succeeding Churches, untill idolatry came in, casteth a marvellous disgrace upon this Popish gesture of kneeling. Now the Def. dareth not deny the allegation it is so manifest, but first giveth a reason of it: and then inferreth upon it; first, that in those ages there were Ecclesiasticall ceremonies of mans appointing; and secondly, that the Church hath liberty in altering such Rites. Concerning these deductions, answer hath been given in the generall part of this Reply. The ground of them is this: Whatsoever was practised in ancient Churches, that is good and lawfull. Much thankses will the superstitious Papists giue him for this grant. It sufficeth us for the present, that the Defend. granteth all that is objected.

SECT. XIX.

THe fourth accusation is thus set down by the Defendant: *Many people in the land, think that this gesture of kneeling is necessary.* It is taken out of the Abridg. p. 42: for he still goeth backward in his collections. Now in the Abridgment, the peoples opinion is brought in, to proue that this kneeling is esteemed a part of Gods worship, in these words: *Very many people, in all parts of the land, hold this opinion of it, that the Sacrament cannot reverently, or worthily be received with any other gesture: yea, many of the learned haue not stuck to defend it in this sort.* What saith the Defend. to this? Forsooth, that *the error*
of

of the people is to be imputed unto Ministers, either idle, or ignorant, or else too busie. And that it may be the principall error is the jealousy of the accusers, because he knoweth scarce any that hold this gesture essentiall unto the communion. Where 1, there is nothing at all said, that doth contradict the accusation by any Logicke. 2 If the fault be in idle and ignorant Ministers, I aske, as of old it was demanded concerning Saul; *Who is their father?* Is it not the Hierarchie? Are not their fathers also the Bishops, for the most part, as idle (in regard of the work of the Ministerie) as those which are most idle? Have our graue Convocation men so much leasure to obtrude unnecessary Ceremonies upon painfull understanding Ministers, while there be so many idle ignorant Ministers in their Diocesses unreformed? Can they find means to deprive painfull understanding Ministers, for want of conformity unto unnecessary rites, & no way to reform idleness & ignorance in those that conform? Surely, they are in this respect fathers; not in God, as they would be filed; but, I will not say in whom. 3 I aske, if communicants be not essentiall unto the communion? If they be, then I ask further, If the gesture of kneeling be not, among us, made essentiall unto a communicant? Surely, that which bringeth some vertue with it to the essence, and being, of a communicant; and without which no man (what vertue or grace soever he hath) can haue the esse, or being, of a communicant, that in reason may be called essentiall unto him, as he is a communicant. But *essentiall* is his own word. The Abridgment speaketh of that opinion which holdeth that the Sacrament cannot be received reverently and worthily without kneeling. And this opinion the Defend. neither could deny, because it is so common and well-known: nor yet durst defend, because it is so absurd; and therefore shuffeleth in this terme of *essentiall to the communion*.

SECT. XX.

IT followeth in the Abridgment, upon the former words, that *R. Edwards common-prayer-book saith, it is enjoyned to avoide the profanation of the Sacrament*. Intending to shew, that it is an opinion received, even from the beginning of this injunction, that the Sacrament could not be reverently and worthily received without kneeling.

Here the Defend. asketh, *If the Sacraments cannot be profaned? and if the Church had not reason to prevent this profanation?* To which (though it be nothing but a flourish beside the purpose.) I answer, Yes, the Sacraments may be violated, both

by prophanation, and also by superstition. Nay, they are so violated ordinarily in England; and our Bishops, in stead of preventing, have provided that it must be so. Prophaned they are, by prophane Ministers of the Bishops making and maintaining: by prophane communicants, whom godly Ministers are forbidden to keep back from the communion by the Bishops and their officers: and by prophane forbidding of many godly men from partaking of them, whom Christ doth admit to have part in himselfe, and them. They are superstitiously also abused, as other waies, so also by these ceremonies in question, as hath been proved. And surely superstition was never appointed of God, for a remedy against prophanenesse.

2. Next, he telleth us the reason, why this gesture was appointed, viz. *that thereby we might testifie our due estimation of such holy rites, and repell the staine and ignominie which virulent and unhalloved tongues did cast upon them.* Where 1. I ask if due estimation of holy rites cannot sufficiently bee testified without kneeling? Let the Defendant speak from his conscience, whether in that congregation, where the people are duely prepared unto the communion by the minister, and warned religiously to prepare themselves, the precious also being separated from the vile, whether (I say) in such a congregation, though no other gesture be used in receiving, then the Apostles used, there be not a better estimation of the sacrament testified, then is ordinarily in the most parishes of England, where kneeling is urged and used. *Chrysostome* taxeth well one of our ordinarie ministers or communicants, who stand so much upon kneeling, and so little upon maine duties: *In parvo quidem es tam reverens, sordidam autem habens animam accedis?* ad pop. Ant. 61. that is, *art thou so reverent in a trifle, and yet comest to the table having a foule soule?* 2. I demand if kneeling had been formerly intermitted in England, and if that intermission had been the cause of prophane reproches? if it had not (as the truth is it had not) how could this be a remedy? 3. I would faine know, what should be the cause that in other Churches a remedy can be found against such reproches, without kneeling, and not in ours? 4. The true reason of retaining kneeling and such like ceremonies in good King *Edwards* dayes, must be fetched not out of the Defendants vaine conjectures, but out of good testimonies of those which then lived. Now *Iohannes à Lasco*, a godly learned man, who then was in England, and acquainted with the chiefeest protestants, and with their counsells, in his preface before his book of Ecclesiasticall order, thus testifieth: *Cupiebat rex ille sanctissimum its restitutam (quoad eius fieri posset) in universo regno suo omnem*

omnem plane religionem ut nulla fere alia de re pro ætate sua sollicitus magis esset : sed cum leges quæ tam patrie obstarent, quo minus publici potissimum cultus divini ritus sub Papismo usurpati (pro eo ac rex ipse cupiebat) repargiri protinus possent : ego vero pro peregrinorū ecclesijs sedulo instarem : ita demum placuit, ut ritus publici in Anglicis ecclesijs per gradus quosdam (quantum per leges patrias omnino liceret) repurgarentur : peregrinis vero hominibus (qui patrijs hac alioqui in parte non usque adeo tenerentur) ecclesiæ concederentur, in quibus omnia libere, & nulla rituum patriorum habita ratione, iuxta doctrinam duntaxat atque observationem Apostolicam, instituerentur. Ita enim fore, ut Anglicæ quoque ecclesiæ ad puritatem Apostolicam amplectendam, unanimi omnium ordinum consensu excitarentur. Non deerant tamen qui id moleste ferrent, adeoque & reluctati fuerint huic instituto regio. that is, That most holy king was so carefull to have the whole religion (s. farre as in him lay) reformed in his whole kingdom, that he was in that his youth more carefull about this matter then any else : But whereas certaine lawes of that countrey hindered, that the rites of Gods worship, specially those which were publick, and had been used in Popery, could not be wholly purged and rooted out, as the king desired; and I was very earnest and urgent for the Churches of the strangers; at last it was thus decreed, that the publick rites used in the Churches of England, should by certaine degrees (so farre as might any way stand with the lawes of the countrey) be purged and reformed : but to the strangers (who in this regard were not so much bound with the lawes of the countrey) churches should bee granted, in which all things might be freely ordained onely according to the doctrine and observation of the Apostles, without having any regard of the rites of that countrey. For so it would come to passe, that the English Church also would with an unanimous consent of all estates, bee stirred up to embrace the Apostolicall puritie; yet there were some who took this very evil, yea and resisted this decree of the king. In which words it is to be marked, 1 that the king and those good men that were his directors, desired all such ceremonies to be cast out of the Church, as the strangers then had leaue to reject. Among which Surplice, crosse and kneeling had a chiefe place. 2 That their intent was hindered by lawes, customes, and sway of the time. 3 That they did not therefore lay aside that purpose, but waited a fit opportunitie, and used the best meanes they could to compasse and accomplish the same. This further appeareth by the reformation of Ecclesiasticall lawes, set forth in latine, in the dayes of King Edward: where about the communion, there is no mention made of kneeling, but rather of sitting, when it is layd there to be an uncomely thing, ut minister solus in convivio propter multos institutus sedeat, 1 that the minister

ster should sit alone at a feast ordained for many. *De divinis officiis, cap. 8.* 4 That the reproches of black mouthed Papists were not such effectuall motives unto them, as the Defendant imagineth: for then they would not have suffered the strangers to have given occasion of their continuance. 5 That some close dissembling adversaries did hinder the work of reformation so much as they could; and so indeed they have done ever since: and doe at this day: to whom we are beholding for these burthens, which this Defendant to their great content, doth so stiffly strive to maintaine. That hath in this case fallen out unto us in part (and much more of it we have just cause to feare) which *Philippus Marnixius de institutione principum ac nobilium liberorum*: that is, concerning the institution of the children of Princes and Nobles, p. 15. hath gravely and wisely observed to bee the ordinary issue of such tolerations *Permulti nescio quam, prudentie existimationem ex eo aucupantur, quod dum se hominum meritis accommodant, non pauca in Dei cultu, ac religione, vitiosa tolerari volunt, quae à verbo Dei aliena esse non ignorant: & interea suos liberos à prima aetate, in eiusmodi prava consuetudine studiose retinent: quo fit partim humani ingenij natura, partim iusto Dei cultum suum vindicantis iudicio, ut optimorum principum liberi à vera & recta religione non raro in impios & prophanos cultus, & pravas superstitiones dilabuntur. Nec enim aliunde profectum esse arbitror, quod in populo Judaico, sanctissimorum regum liberi, tam proclivi lapsu ad superstitiones in lege Dei veritas resisterint, nisi quod videbant suos parentes, et si fortasse cultum idolorum adversati fuissent, ipsa tamen simulacra, atque altaria, & aeraque idololatrie instrumenta retinuisse, quod et si nescio qua mollitie animi, vel populo, vel proceribus, vel denique tranquillitati publicae dedissent, à posteris tamen in exemplum arreptum fuit, & universo tandem populo cessit in perniciem*: that is, Many men in this seek for I know not what estimation of prudence and wisdom; because to apply themselves to the manners of men, they will in Gods worship, and in religion, tolerate many bad things which they know to be contrary to Gods word: and yet are carefull to retaine their children, from their youth up, in such an evill custome, whereby it cometh to passe, partly, by the nature of their own wit and disposition, partly by the just judgement of God, standing for his owne worship, that the children of very good Princes often fall away from the true and right religion, to ungodly and prophane worships, and evill superstitions. For hence it was, and hence onely (as I take it) that among the Jewes the children of very godly Kings so easly fell to superstitions forbidden by the law of God; because they saw that their parents, who (it may be) were against the worshipping of Idolls, yet retained and kept still the Images, altars, and other instruments of Idolatry, which though (out of a soft and quiet

God save
Pr. Charles.

quiet disposition of their minds) they yeelded to the people, Nobles, or the publick peace and quietnesse, yet posteritie followed that example, and it became the ruine of the whole people.

3 In the third place the Defendant desireth us to be contented by the way to be put in minde of our ignorance; which we are very willing to, and shall be thankfull to him when he hath helped us to see it. You confound (saith he) an accidentall and an essentiall necessitie together. This indeed is our ignorance: for we know not, nor can see in the words of the Abridgement now questioned, any mention at all either of essentiall, or of accidentall, or yet of necessitie. But must wee needs be accused of ignorance, if we doe not bring forth by divination, every distinction in our argument, which the copious invention of the Defendant can afford for the avoyding of it, even when the distinction toucheth not any tearme or part of the argument? then I am afrayd the Defendant himselve in his oppositions will hardly escape the same imputation. And yet what is the distinction? *Necessitie, is either essentiall or accidentall, as food is necessarie for man essentially, but physick accidentally. So the gesture of kneeling is necessary onely accidentally, for the reforming of the prophane behaviour of many.* Essentiall and accidentall are but words of obscuritie: the meaning is, as appeareth by the example, that some things are ordinarily, fit, or necessarie, and some (which is the condition of physick and kneeling) onely upon extraordinarie or speciall occasion: as physick when men are sicke, and kneeling at the communion, when men use prophane behaviour. If this be all, then surely we are not so ignorant, but we can see the vanitie of this shift. For 1 physick is to be taken in the time of need, not alwayes; but our miserable physitions haue prescribed kneeling for continuall use these threescore yeares and ten, which is the age of a man; and so are resolved to cloy us with the same drug still, though prophane men can easily swallow it, and many good Christians loath it. 2 They doe not prescribe it as physick, but as food: for they say it is a gesture of reverence, which is due in regard of the nature of the action, whatsoever we be for condition or constitution. 3 By this the wisedome of the Apostle himselve is impeached, who seeing prophane behaviour to be used at the communion among the Corinthians, never thought of this physick of kneeling, but contented himselve with the word and censures, which was also the onely ecclesiasticall remedie that was appointed in the ecclesiasticall lawes of King Edward against prophanesse. *de Div. off. c. 8.*

SECT. XXI.

A Fifth accusation pressed upon this gesture of kneeling, is, that it grew first from the persuasion of the reall presence, and transubstantiation: being never enioyned to any Church til Antichrist grew to the full height, there being no action in all his service so idolatrous as this. So that we may well conclude, that of all the ceremonies that ever were used in Poperie, none may be so properly termed Popish and Antichristian as this.

Here the Defendant being put to his shifts, answereth nothing directly, but divideth his forces. 1 In the dayes of the ancient fathers there was used (sayth he) an outward adoration by bowing of the body, naming divers fathers, but expressing the words onely of Cyril, Augustine, and Chrysostome. To which I answer, 1 that the question here is onely of kneeling, & not of other gestures. 2 It is not now neither inquired, what was voluntarily spoken or practised by particular men: but what was enioyned unto Churches. 3 These very places of Cyril, Augustine, and Chrysostome, are usually urged by Papists for their idolatry: the Defendant therefore doth not well still to borrow their weapons for to fight against us with: for the borrower is a servant unto the lender. But the ceremonies themselves being borrowed of the Papists, it is no marvell if our Prelates be beholding also to the Papists for proofes to maintaine them by. 4 As for Cyril, 1 D. Fulk against the cavills of Sanders, p. 687. sayth of one precept of Cyrils, about the sacrament, extant in the same page out of which the Defendant citeth his, *Verily I take it for a meere superstitious precept*. May not this be also superstitious which the Defendant cite h? Sure I am, that about the sacraments, and about the crosse, and christene, there is much superstition taught in the catechismes which goe under the name of Cyril. 2 I say Cyril is corrupted both by the Defendant and by the Bishop of Rochester, p. 183. For first the Greek word being *κνίπται*, Rochester translateth it *falling on thy face*, and the Defendant, *bowing thy selfe*: whereas though the word be many times used in such a sense, yet (as Stephen in his Greek treasure sheweth) it signifieth properly a gesture of the eyes: which appereth plainly by the words compounded of it *απακνίπται πνευματικῶς*. And that Cyril respected the gesture of the eye, it is very probable, because in the receiving of the bread, he biddeth the communicant *first to sanctifie his eyes with it, and then to take it*. In proportion whereof these words cited are used concerning the cup *κνίπται*. &c. Beside, Cyril doth manifestly referre the adoration and worship he

he speaketh of, unto the saying of *Amen*. *κύπτων, καὶ τρωπῶ
προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβασματὸς λέγων τὸ αἶμεν*: that is, loo-
king down steadfastly upon it, and saying amen in manner of adoration
and worship. What reason then had Rochester first, and then Che-
ster to apply the manner of worship and adoration unto the bo-
dily gesture signified in the word *κύπτων*? 3 seeing Cyril hath
no precept of bowing the body at the receiving of the bread,
he cannot be so interpreted concerning the wine, without im-
putation of a superstitious advancing of the wine aboue the
bread. 4 Seeing Cyril had such leysure to appoynt his com-
municant so many superstitious toyes about the sacrament, wi-
th particular descriptions, as that he should in taking of the bread, hold
his fingers together, beare up his right hand with his left, take it in the
bellow of his right hand so born up, taking great heed that no crumme
fall, &c. he would surely more expressly haue spoken of knee-
ling, if it had been used in his time. *Augustines* words, *Nemo
carnem illam manducat, priusquam adoraverit*: that is, No man eats
that flesh before he haue worshipped, are well expounded by *Morny
de euchar.* l. 4. c. 7. of the adoration of faith and affection referred
unto Christ in heaven, *nisi adoraverit vera fide, affectu & effectu*:
that is, except he haue worshipped by true faith, affection and effect.
Chrysostomes counsell is very good, *adora & communica*: pray
unto God for his grace, worship him in coming to the sacra-
ment, and so come. That this was *Chrysostomes* meaning, ap-
peareth plainly by the words of the crier there mentioned, *abi-
te qui non potestis orare*: that is, get away ye who cannot pray. And
again, *Oremus omnes communiter*: that is, let us pray all toge-
ther.

Lastly he concludeth, that it is more then his bookes doe teach
him, that *Honorius* the Pope was the first author of this gesture: nei-
ther will he contend whether it was *Honorius* or *Innocentius*. Where
1. it is to be observed, that after many words hee granteth the
whole accusation: for he leaveth the credit of that invention
betwixt *Honorius*. and *Innocentius*: both of which were grosse
patrons of transubstantiation. 2 Whereas he sayth, his bookes
doe not teach him that *Honorius* was the Author, he much for-
getteth himselfe. For Bale in the life of *Honorius*, Iuel against
Harding, in the article of adoration, *Morny de euchar.* lib. 1. cap. 9.
Hospinian de sacr. c. 1. p. 372. doe with one consent affirme it: and
D. Morton himselfe, in the protestants appeale, l. 4. c. 29 f. 15.
doth approue the same truth: and in this very place doth cite
Zepperus speaking as much: as for that mitigation which he u-
seth, viz. that the words of *Honorius* doe signifie rather a bowing

of the body, then a bending of the knee, it maketh against himselfe. For if that should be the meaning, then *Honorius* was the first that enioyned bowing of the body, and so that bodily adoration which formerly he avouched to have been in use among the Fathers, was a meere fiction of his, at least for the prescribing of it: and thence also it will follow, that kneeling was hatched since *Honorius*: for if kneeling had then been received, there had been no need of a decree for bowing of the body. Thus to returne upon him his owne proverbe, *He is out shot in his owne bow*. And if he shall say, that *Honorius* was the first indeed that appointed adoration of the sacrament: but not in the sacrament; then is he the second time out-shot: for by that hee confesseth, that *reverenter inclinare corpus cum elevabitur hostia*: to incline reverently the body when the sacrament is lifted up, is to adore the sacrament. For those and no other are the words of *Honorius*.

SECT. XXII.

Here another accusation is propounded, viz. *That this gesture of kneeling in the act of receiving, to have been of old, and to be still abused to idolatry*. This is propounded I say, but not answered at all by deniall, or by distinguishing, onely the Defendant sayth, that *Protestants in kneeling doe not abuse the elements to idolatry*: which is nothing at all to the purpose now in hand: For the argument in the Abridgement is, that *it is unlawfull to use (much more to command the use of) such ceremonies in the worship of God, as man hath devised, if they be notoriously knowne to have been of old, and still to be abused unto idolatry or superstition, by the Papists, specially if the same be now of no necessarie use in the Church*. Abridgm. pag. 17. to which argument, the words here cited by the Defendant, out of p. 30. are but part of the assumption. What logick is there then in this answer, *We do not abuse them to idolatry*? But the Defendant addeth very peremptorily, that *our Bishops (for those are his Protestants) hate the Romish Moloch as much as doth any Non-conformist*. I could wish for our Prelates sake, (as ill as I loue their wretched courses) that this were true. But 1. is not this now the most received currant opinion among our Prelates concerning the sacrament, that Christ is there present, but for the manner of his presence, whether it be by transubstantiation, consubstantiation, or otherwise that is not to be enquired? 2. If they hated the Popish idolatry as much as others, they would also (as others doe) hate the garments and appurtenances that are spotted with it.

Iude 23. If we have any drop of good zeal in us (sayth Calvin) it must needs vex and grieve us, to see the marks and signes of idolatry. Quid verba audiam, quam facta videam? What is it to heare words, when I see the deeds? Hatred seeketh utter abolishing, or at least full and perfect separation. If this be found in our Prelats in regard of the appurtenances of Popish idolatry, it is pittie that they expresse it no otherwise then by advancing them.

SECT. XXIII.

IN the same fashion he reciteth other words out of the Abridgement, p. 42. where they say, *kneeling is by all men confessed to be a chiefe part of religious adoration: and therefore it is a part of worship; but answereth nothing, but onely sayth, that before, part. 1. c. 2. he hath proved the ceremonies to be no essentiall parts of worship. It is sufficient therefore to answer, that in refutation of that chapiter, the vanitie of his proofes is plainly detected; yet further it may be added, that as the words of the Abridgement import, beside the common nature of ceremonies, this is proper to kneeling in religious actions, that it is of it selfe worship. It is no sufficient answer therefore to put off this objection with a common plea, which equally appertaineth unto all ceremonies.*

SECT. XXIII.

THE authors of the Abridgement are brought in thus reasoning, *to adore God in or before any creature without warrant of the word of God, is idolatry.* But the reason as it standeth in the Abridgement, p. 66. hath another face and force. *For men (say they) to tie themselves to adore God, in or before any creature, without warrant of the word, is idolatry. This argument is pressed by the Palatine Divines, by Ursinus, Zanchius, Hospinian, Polanus, and Bellarmine himselfe. Now let us heare the Defendant his answer. This position (sayth he) may not runne currant without all exception. It hath hitherto runne currant among all our Divines in their writings against the religious use of images: as may appeare by the testimonies alledged in the Abridgement. And further, Zanchie de red. p. 467. hath these words, *Omnis adoratio ad imaginem exhibita peccatum est & idololatria: that is, All adoration or worship done to an image, is sinne and idolatry. Mr. Perkins de idololat. In & coram imaginibus colere Deum, nihil aliud est quam idololatriam committere: that is, to worship God in and before images, is nothing else but to commit idolatry.* And yet further applying*

the rule to our purpose. *Adorationem nostram dirigere ad panem, vel locum in quo panis est, quid aliud est nisi manifesta idololatria?* that is, to direct our worship to the bread, or to the place wherein the bread is, what is it but manifest idolatry. The Defendant therefore had need bring some strong barres to stop this current, and these they are. If these prepositions, *by, in, before,* be excluded from the act of adoration of God, or Christ, onely in respect of the creatures then we may not pray in the temple with our tongues, or before the Lords table, or yet the heavens themselves. Where it is to be marked how ridiculously pleasant the Defendant is in so weightie a cause, He speaketh of that description which our Divines generally give of idolatry, in their disputes against the Papists, as if it were a part of the Comedie called *Bellum Grammaticale*, wherein the controversie is onely about the admitting or excluding of prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, and such like words of lesser moment.

2 How he forgetteth that wherein the sinewes of the Argument doth consist, viz. that the Abridgment expressly speaketh of mens *tying themselves* to adore before a creature, *without Warrant of the Word*. Now to pray with our lips: in the Temple, before the Lords table, and the heavens, haue expresse warrant in Gods word.

3 I will answer this idle objection in the words of Dr. Abbot in his defence of Mr. Perkins against Bishop. p. 1202. *Yes, but (saith he) a man could not kneele before the Arke, but he must needs also kneele before the Cherubins. Well, and if Mr. Bishop be in place, where he cannot kneele to God, but he must needs haue an image before him, we condemn him not. Wee cannot kneel to God, but there are many things before us, our Churches, our houses, the aire, the heaven, the Sunne, the Moon, the Starres: but there is great difference, what standeth before us by casuall or necessary position of place, and what we sit before us by intendment of affection. A man cannot kneele before the King, but they must needs be before him, that are about the King, as must also the seat, or the horse whereon the King sitteth: and yet we doe not say, that hee kneeleth before them that are about the King, or before the Kings seat, or his horse; because hee hath no intention of them, but onely of the King. Let our Bishop also take this answer, and leaue his trifling.*

SECT. XXV.

Vnder the name of Mr. Nic. is brought in next this Argument: *All relative adoration of God before a creature, without respect unto it, is idolatry &c.* Now this is no new argument,

ment, but a repetition of the former: yet the Def. bringeth another answer. *Relative adoration*, is either fastened upon the creature, that it may so be conveyed unto the Creator: or else fastened upon God, with a relation from him unto the creature. The former (saith he) is Popish: the latter is our own practise in reverencing of the Word, the Lords day, Temples &c. Shall these bee used (saith he) with a religious reverence, and shall onely the blessed Sacrament be celebrated without any such reverence? Whereupon he concludeth very poetically, *Procul hinc, procul este profani*; that is, Away, away yee prophane ones. Though afterward he subjoyneth for shame a kinde of mitigation.

Where, 1 he partly favoureth, and partly wrongeth the Papists too much, in esteeming that adoration onely to be Popish, which is first fastened upon the creature: for *Alexander Halensis*, *Durandus*, *Olcoth*, and diverse others (who yet were Popish Idolaters) deny their religious adoration, which they performe before an image, to be terminated in the image at all.

2 The distinction which he useth is his own invention, and meer imagination. For neither did any good Divine ever use it; nor was any Idolater ever so senselesse as to propound it for an excuse. For to fasten adoration upon God, that from him it might be referred unto a creature, is worse then either Papists or Heathens ever defended. This were to make God the deriving object, and the creature afterward the last and chiefe.

3 What an idle thing is it for the Def. to confound adoration, and religious reverence, as he doth, in disputing, from our practise, to his own conceit? Marke gentle reader (saith Dr. Abbot of Bishop, p. 1206.) that whereas he propounded to prove, that the Arke was worshipped, hee maketh his conclusion, that the Arke was had in great reverence: But they had the Temple also in great reverence; and the Altars, and the offerings, and all things that by the Law were commanded to be holy; and will hee therefore inferre, that all these were to be worshipped? They were to haue the Priests in great reverence, and specially the High Priest; and shall we therefore say, that they worshipped the Priests? What is this reverence, but a religious respect and care, of the sacred and due usage of holy things according to their kinde?

4 As for our practise, we would be ashamed, if to all holy things we did not giue more due reverence then the Prelates. The Word therefore we would not haue paralleld with Apocriphall writings, nor chaunted over by Singing men, like a charme; nor one part of it used with lesse reverence then another, as it is in their Cathedrall Churches: but all propounded and received as the Word of God, with prayer, feare and

trembling. Wee hold that godly people ought to humble their soules privately and solitarily ere they come into the Assembly of Gods Saints, to the publick worship of God, and not to put off their preparation till they come thither. The Lords day we hold should be sanctified, even publickly with two Sermons, and not posted over with red service. The Temples themselves (taken joyntly with the Congregation assembled in them) we hold to be places onely for Gods Ordinances, and not for mans presumptuous devices. The Sacraments we hold proper unto those, that in word and deed shew themselves worthy: not fit for every man that is not presented in the Bishops Court, or being presented for grievous sinne, hath given the Court satisfaction by mony, though he hath given the Congregation none by repentance. Now let him sing out of the Poet, *Procul hinc, procul este, i. Away, away yee prophane ones*, and see whether it belong not rather to himselfe and his fellowes then to us.

SECT. XXVI.

AMong other answers unto pretences used for excuse of this gesture, one principall colour is; that *if the King should giue us ought, it would become us to receiue it in the most reverent manner we are able, &c.* To this the Abridg. giveth divers answers, p. 67. 68, the fourth of which is; that *there is no proportion between the civill reverence given to a King, or to the gift we receive from him, and this religious reverence wee shew to these holy things, For there is farre more danger of idolatry heer then there: yea this hath been found in all ages the chiefe root of idolatry (if it be not grosse idolatry it selfe) to giue unto the sign or gift, that outward reverence and adoration, that is due to the thing signified, or to the giver himselfe.* This answer, the Def. according to his perverse manner, turneth into an argument, but giveth no answer unto it at all, saue onely by calling it *a sinister supposition, a godlesse asperson and calumination, to be punished with sharp censures and corrections.* Whereas the truth is, (as any indifferent Reader may see) these words in the Abridgment are onely generally spoken, by way of answer, as equally belonging to all ages, plentifully confirmed throughout the Scriptures. So that this was but a shiness in the Def. to start at a shadow. Yet if they had been particularly applyed, they might haue been well defended.

SECT. XXVII.

IT followeth in the Abridgment, p. 68. It is evident that this gesture is not injoyned or used in respect of any lawfull or convenient reverence, that is due to the Sacrament. For neither at the administration of Baptism, nor at the hearing of the Word read or preached is any such gesture used: To both which notwithstanding there is every whit as much reverence due as to the Supper of the Lord, unlesse we will say with the idolatrous Papists (whose conceit by this our practise we greatly confirme) that the Eucharist is a greater Sacrament, and of farre more dignity then Baptisme. The Def. his answer standeth on these two Assertions: 1 We kneele at the Eucharist rather then at Baptism, to confute the Papists, who vilifie our Eucharist, more then our Baptisme. 2 Wee would be willing also to kneele at Baptisme, especially when prayer is used. The first of which is, as it to confute the Papists, who say we vilifie Christ and his image, the blessed Virgin and her picture, wee should kneele before the Crucifixe, and Ladies picture as they doe. Beside, if this be the onely cause, then is not this gesture used simply for due reverence, which is the very point that the Abridgment in these words proveth. The second assertion is quite beside the purpose. For the question is not of kneeling at prayer, but of kneeling in reverence to the Sacrament.

SECT. XXVIII.

ANother piece of an answer used by the Abridgment p. 66, the Defendant maketh here a third reason, viz. That Bellarmine de Euch. l. 2, c. 18, inferreth thus (upon their opinion that hold Christ, though he be not corporally present in the Sacrament, yet he may be adored in the Sacrament, and in that respect we may kneele before the Sacrament) then, saith he, it is not idolatry to kneele before images. Vpon this, the Defendant bringeth in a play (as he calleth it) consisting of foure parts, acted by severall parties. But to make short worke, the first thing pertinent in this play, is that Peter Martyr, defending the common cause of all Protestants, sayd, that Christ is worshipped in the signe. Which is manifestly false. For it is not the received opinion of Protestants, that Christ is to be worshipped in the bread and wine. This Bellarmine knew well enough, De Euch. l. 4, c. 29, The approved opinion among Protestants, is that which Zanchie setteth downe, De Redempt. p. 486. That although Christs bodie were really present in the bread, yet it ought not to be worshipped there:

there: because it is appointed there to be eaten and not to be worshipped; and for men to appoint worship is abomination: Much lesse when the case is cleane otherwise. *Peter Martyr* living in England, and writing against *Gardiner*, an English Papist, giveth first as good an answer as he could to the objection, without prejudicing our English practise. But presently after, addeth another more direct, as is to be seen even in that place of *Bellarmino*.

Secondly, the Defendant saith, *Wee doe let ray Peter Martyr into the hands of Bellarmine*. To which I answer, that *Bellarmino* himselfe did see that *Peter Martyr* in that answer spake not fully his minde, and therefore did not rest in it. *Hac solutione non contentus P. Martyr, paulo infra aperit mentem suam*: that is, not content with this answer, a little after sheweth what his judgement was. It is not therefore *P. Martyr*, but an imperfect answer of that age, and proper to England, which we forsake. And if the Defendant thinketh the consequence which *Bellarmino* maketh out of that answer to be unsound, why doth he not here, when it so much concerned his cause, shew us how to answer and refute it?

Thirdly, the Defendant telleth us, that *our adoration in the Sacrament, in P. Martyrs judgement, is no more then at the hearing of the Word to lift up our hearts unto God*. That good man in deed would haue as little as may be made of it, because he did not like it. But if he had judged it in deed no more, he would never haue perswaded to the forbearing of it, as he did by the Defendants own confession in this place. But *that was onely untill men were better instructed*. True, some good understanding men in those daies would haue had such Ceremonies rejected or forborne, untill men were better instructed: thinking that after instruction none would be so foolish as to use them: others yeilded to a retayning of them untill such time as men were better instructed, imagining that after instruction they would vanish of themselves, being rejected by all. Both these counsels are found in the writings of *Martyr* and *Bucer*. But our Prelats haue gone beyond their simplicity. For they say the people are sufficiently instructed (they meane sufficiently for their purpose) the ceremonies therefore shall be retayned and urged. *If the people be not instructed* (saith the Defendant) *the fault is in the ignorance or negligence of their Teachers*; that is, according to the phrase both of Scripture and ancient Fathers, of the Bishops. But our Apostolick Bi. will haue others to be teachers, that they may haue the more leasure to urge Ceremonies. And if there be ignorance also and negligence in the peoples Teachers,

Teachers, that is nothing to our Bishops: But if there be Non-conformity in any, they can soon make the Church (if not the land) too hote for such disordered fellowes.

SECT. XXIX. XXX. XXXI. XXXII.
XXXIII. XXXIIII.

IN all these Sections, the Defendant striveth to shew a difference, betwixt the Romish kneeling, and our English, at the receiving of the Sacrament; which is a thing that wee never doubted of, viz. that there is a difference betwixt some of them and us, at least in the degree of this evill. Yet let us hearken a little to that which hee propoundeth.

In the 29 and 30 Sections, we haue a Preface making way for a large discourse.

In 31 Section, the most tolerable image-worship of Papists, is propounded out of *Durandus*, who with divers other Papists deny, that images are to be properly worshiped, but onely God at or before the image, in these words: *This kinde of worship of an image, is but improperly and abusively so called; because by the image we haue a remembrance of the person, which is worshipped as well in the presence of the image, as if he were really present.* Now the Defendant should shew a difference betwixt this kneeling before Images, and our kneeling before the bread and wine. Mark therefore what he bringeth. First he asketh, whether wee ever heard any approved Doctor in our Church teach that we doe, or ought to kneel before the Sacrament, that by it, or in it, we may personally worship Christ, as if he were really present?

To which I answer, If he aske of the very words, I dare not trust my memory so farre as to avouch it: but if he speaketh of the sense, I say, yes. I haue heard in a publick Sermon more harsh sentences then this, delivered by a Doctor so approved in our Church, that now he is made a Bishop. But I need not name him, or seek for any other, I affirme, and will make it clear, that Dr. *Morton* himselfe in this book doth teach every thing that is in this sentence, even to a haire, so farre as it agreeth with *Durandus* his words formerly cited, to which also this question as paralel is referred.

1 Dr. *Morton* teacheth, maintaineth, and disputeth, that we ought to kneele before the Sacrament: This he cannot deny, untill he hath called in and renounced this defence of his.

2 Dr. *Morton* teacheth that these prepositions *by* and *in the Sacrament*, are not simply to be excluded, Sect. 24, and if in any sense they may be admitted, then surely in that which *Durandus*

thus expresseth, when he saith, *in the presence of the image or Sacrament.*

3 Dr. *Morton* will not deny (I hope) but when and where-soever Christ is to be worshipped, hee is personally to be worshipped.

4. Neither can he deny, but whensoever Christ is worshipped, hee is as well to be worshipped, as if hee were really present,

So that we have every part and particle of this Assertion held and taught by the Defendant himselfe: viz. that we ought to kneele before the Sacrament; that by it, or in it, we may personally worship Christ, as if he were really present. All the vvit in Lichfield vvill never vvind him out of this snare, vvherin he is by himselfe infolded.

I vvill yet be a little bolder, and affirme, that Dr. *Morton* doth allow worshipping of some images themselues, as much as *Durandus*. For he alloweth of images for commemoration, p. 1, ch. 3. s. 7, and upon religious remembrance to worship before the remembrancer: hee approveth heer, Sect. 40. *Durandus* doth no more to a Crucifixe.

In the second place he sheweth what superstition the Papists haue in their adoration: But bringeth no prooffe of what hee saith, saue out of *Bellarmin*, who is in this question an adversary of *Durandus*, and therefore his opinion cannot shew the difference betwixt us and *Durandus*. Yet *Bellarmino* saith nothing neither (except the word *merit*) which Dr. *Morton* in this defence doth not maintain. Neither is that superstition intrinsecall to the adoration.

Thirdly, he describeth our kneeling to be used, that upon sight of this Sacrament, as as a visible Word, our hearts may be moved unto a spirituall contemplation of God, and of Christ, unto Whom we pray. And is not this the very same with that which *Durandus* saith of kneeling before an image, by the image wee haue a remembrance of the person which is worshiped? Is not his remembrance, one and the same thing with the Defendant his spirituall contemplation? Heer then is no difference of adoration, but of words onely.

Lastly, when he cannot declare any difference, he giveth us these termes to chew upon. The Papists adoration is somewhat inhaesive in objecto, or adhaesive per objectum: but ours is, abstractiue ab objecto. Dr. *Abbot* saith well, p. 1219, It is a speciall faculty that men attain unto by Romish learning, that they are able at any time by a distinction to mock God. I will not directly apply that speech unto the Defend. but this I am sure of, by this distinction the people of God are meerly mocked. For the question

is of no small matter, but of idolatrie: The argument is plain, and every ordinarie Christian can understand it, *You doe the very same thing that the Papists doe, When they commit idolatry: the answer is by a distinction, The Papists doe it inhaesive in objecto, or adhaesive per objectum: but We doe it abstractive ab objecto.* When the Minister propoundeth this answer for to give satisfaction unto the people, what must they say, surely the best they can say is, that which often they bring forth, after flaunting Sermons: *Our Preacher made the case as clear to day as could be.* Why what did he say? *Nay he spoke so profoundly and learnedly, that We could not understand him.* *Nos barones stupemus, i. We poor men are amazed.* Well, yet if the people be not sufficiently instructed (saith the Defendant) it is their Teachers ignorance, or idlenesse: and *if the people Will not bow their knees, We Will break their backs* say our great Prelats. This is the onely answer and argument, which will hold at a dead lift, when all other faile.

But to inquire a little into this obscure answer: 1 what doth *Durandus* allow of in kneeling before images, which the Defendant doth not in kneeling before the bread and wine? *Somewhat* saith he: but what that somewhat is, he cannot tell: and if I should aske him, who gives testimonie of that *somewhat*: he may as well answer, *what doe you call him?* 2 How doe they give that somewhat of adoration to the image? either *inhaesive* (saith he) or *adhaesive*, hee cannot tell which. And the truth is, that *Durandus*, and those more ancient Papists, whose opinion he maintaineth, approved of no adoration to be given unto images at all, either *inhaesive*, or *adhaesive*. So *Bonaventure* in *Sent. 1. 3, d. 9. q. 4*, relating their opinion, saith they held *stultum esse honorare rem insensibilem*: it is a foolish thing to honour insensible creatures. *Crucem igitur Christi non esse adorandum nisi in quantum in ea adoratur Christus, neque aliquam ei honoris reverentiam exhibendam, nisi ratione Crucifixi*; that is, *That therefore the crosse of Christ is not be worshipped, save so farre as Christ is worshipped in it, neither that any reverence of honour is to be given to it, but in regard of him who was crucified.* Of this minde was *Alexander Hales* p. 3, q. 3. a. 3, *Major honor qui exhibetur cruci, refertur ad rem significatam cujus est signum, non ad ipsam crucem in se. Vbi est imago ut signum, totus honor refertur ad prototypum. Proclentes adoramus non materiam, sed imaginatum*: that is, *The great honour which is given to the crosse, is referred to the thing signified of whom it is a signe, and not to the very crosse in it selfe; where the image is as a signe, the whole honour is given to the first patterne, when we fall down, we adore or worship, not the materiall thing, but*

the thing imagined. By this it appeareth plainly, that these Papists are falsely charged by the Defendant, with an opinion which they reject.

Now for our adoration, he saith it is: *abstractive ab objecto*; that is, we are moved by this object to worship God. Why this is the very same thing which *Alexander Hales*, in the forecited place, alledgeth for his images: *Imaginem Christi videntes, & salutaris passionis in memoriam venientes, providentes adoramus, non materiam, sed imaginatum*; that is, *When we see the image of Christ, and come to remember his saving passion, forsaking down we worship not the visible matter, but the thing imagined*. So that in all this, there can be shewed no difference betwixt our kneeling before the Sacrament, and many Papists kneeling before images.

In the three next Sections, 32. 33. 34. the grosser conceit of Papists, especially Jesuits, concerning their adoration of Images and of the Sacrament, is largely propounded. Of which declaration there is no other use, but that which some cunning shopkeepers make, of shewing courser stuff unto the Buier, that so he may judge that which they desire to sell, by comparison, to be finer then in deed it is. Though *Bellarmino* was cited in the Abridgment, as concluding shrewdly from our kneeling before the Sacrament, and worshipping of Christ in it, to the proving of some adoration before a crucifixe, yet we never thought, that that kind of adoration which *Bellarmino* himselfe defendeth to be due unto images, and unto the host, is the same with ours in England.

SECT. XXXV. XXXVI. XXXVII.

NOW more distinctly, wee are taught by the Defendant what is the object of our adoration in receiving the Sacrament. And 1 *If our relation (saith he) be made from the signe to Christ, then is the Sacrament, objectum à quo significatioe; the signe moving us to lift up our minds from the earthly object of sense, bread, to the spiritual object of faith, Christ*. Where, I would know, whether the bread be onely an object of our sense, and no way of our adoration? If onely of sense, then the Word moveth as vvell, and is to be used with adoration, as much as the Sacrament, and the Sacrament no more then that. To bow therefore in singular manner before the Sacrament, being no object of adoration, but onely a help unto it, is the very same thing that *Alexander of Hales*, *Durandus*, and such like Papists, say they doe in kneeling before images: who yet, by all our Divines, are indighted of idolatry for so doing. But if
the

the Sacrament be some way an object of our adoration also, then the case is more plain. And that so it is the Defendant sheweth, when he saith; the reverence or adoration is relative from the signe to Christ. For if it be from the signe, it must first be carried to the signe, as a means of conveyance unto Christ. This is more grosse then the other, and commeth neerer unto *Bellarmines* doctrine of Images. It is as if a wife should goe into a strangers bed, that through it she may passe to her husbands.

2 Secondly, sayth he, *our relation may be taken from Christ to the sacrament, as between a giver and his gift.* But the question is of relation which is in our reverence or adoration, unto what object it is referred: not what relation there is between Christ and the sacrament, or betwixt them and us. This therefore is nothing to the purpose. Neither is that any thing which is added, viz. *that the communicant being upon his knees, praying & praising God, this relation is a reverent taking of the gift.* For 1. there is no question of kneeling in prayer and thanksgiving. 2 Prayers and thanksgiving goe before and follow after the act of receiving, they are not necessarie in it: yet our English Canons are fulfilled, if a man kneele in the act of receiving, though hee neither kneele before, nor after in prayer or thanksgiving. 3 Reverent taking is an action in seemly manner performed, not a relation. 4 No man can teach us the reverence of taking better then Christ and his Apostles. This relation betweene a giver and his gift, is illustrated by a similitude of receiving a gift from the hand of a King, sect. 36. for confutation of which *D. Abbots* answer to *Bishop*, p. 1215. may suffice. *We may here conceive that images are (kneeling is) brought to great distresse, in that from arguments in the Schooles, they are faine to fly to ceremonies of the court. It should seeme strange, that formalities observed to Princes in their courts for maiestie and royall state, should be made patternes of religious devotions, to be practised in the Church. But a man in danger of drowning, is glad to catch at every strigge, &c. But let us take the answer which the Defendant alleageth out of the Abridgement, sect. 37. There is no proportion betweene the civill reverence given to a King, or to the gift which we receive from him, and this religious reverence to these bodily things: for there is farre more danger of idolatry here, then there. To which the Defendant answereth, viz. To feare idolatry in the sacrament, is to feare where no feare is. Against which carelesse fearlesse presumption of our Prelates, it sufficeth to oppose the religious ieaousie of our graue Divines, *Bucer, Martyr, Hooper, Beza, Beacon*, and such like, cited in the Abridgement, pag. 61. 63. who all with one consent*

sent with and counsell, that all reliques of sacramental idolatry, and kneeling in speciall should be removed, for feare idolatrie should thereby be continued, countenanced, or any way promoted. One godly speech of Bucer, ser. Angl. 471. I cannot omit to adde. *Si vero diligimus Deum & hospitorem nostrum Iesum Christum, ex toto corde, tota anima, & cunctis viribus, à quo lex pendet omnis: si, ut ex hac dilectione consequi necesse est, illud immense immutabilis charitatis eius beneficium, quod se & in mortem pro nobis, & in alimoniam nobis vite eterne dederit, grati amplectimur, & ut par est suspicimus & adoramus, nihil sane ad extremam reliqui faciemus detestationem & severissimam profligationem omnis eius impietatis atque abominationis, quam Satan per Antichristos suos invexit contra hæc sanctissima mysteria: nihilque prorsus apud nos loci vel invenient, vel retinebant eæ res omnes, verba, gestus, in quibus vel appareat esse aliquid tantis impietatibus affine aut ad ullam rapiatur (quanquam improbe & absque ulla data causa) harum suarum impietatum commendationem & picturam, nisi id existat ex ijs rebus, verbis, aut signis, quæ Dominus noster commendavit. that is, If We love God, and our Saviour Iesus Christ with all our heart, with all our soule, with all our strength, whereupon the whole law dependeth. If, as must needs follow upon that love, we thankfully remember that benefit of his endlesse and unchangeable love, that he gaue himselfe to death for us, and for a nourishment to everlasting life to us, and if we reverence him as is meet, we will omit nothing which may serue to shew our utter detestation and most severe abandoning of all that ungodlines and abomination, which Satan by his Antichrists hath brought in against these most holy mysteries: neither will there be any place at all found in us for any of those things, words, gestures, in which any thing may either appeare to be like to so great impietie or may be (though ungodly and without any occasion given) to any commendation or painting out of these their ungodlinesses, unlesse that come from those things words, or signes which our Lord hath commended. This passage of godly Bucer is to be marked, not onely because it is so opposie unto the Defendant his fearlesnesse, but also, because it sheweth that true thankfulness to God and Christ, and true adoration of Christ in the celebration of the sacrament, doe exclude utterly all such gestures as kneeling before the bread and wine is: so farre be they from being causes of it as the Defendant would beare us in hand.*

2 The Defendant also answereth for his courtly similitude, that though it hath not a proportion of equality to religious reverences, yet it hath the proportion of a similitude, and so doth illustrate. For which there need no more be sayd, then this, Illustrations have no place before proofes. Let him proue or defend by Scripture, and

and good reason the kneeling he standeth for, and then we will not strive with him about illustrations. Yet his illustration faileth many wayes: For 1 no speciall solemnitie may be used in receiving a gift from a king, save that which the King himselfe doth appoint or allow of. He must therefore first shew, that Christ hath appointed kneeling at the receiving of the sacrament, as many kings have appointed it to their subiects at their receiving of some favours from them, before this proportion will hold. 2 Kings admit of some flattering observances sometime, which are not fit to be offered unto God. As for example, some Prelates when they preach before the King, in the midst of their prayer offered unto God, at their naming of the king, use to bow their knee, or bend their body in lowly manner: and yet the same men thinke it not fit to use such observance at the naming of God. 3 The speciall honour due unto kings cannot be given unto their gifts: but Gods gifts through mans perversenesse have often robbed him of his honor, as Calvin sheweth, *Inst.* 14. 17. 316. Yea the author of the book *de vocatione Gentium*, extant among Ambrose his workes, maketh this to be the originall of heathen idolatry; *Ex Dei donis, fecerunt sibi deos*: that is, *Of Gods gifts they have made themselves gods.*

SECT. XXXVIII.

THE second ground of confutation which the Defendant chose to stand upon, is the testimony of protestant Divines, our owne witnesses (as he rightly termeth them) against him in all this controversie. But, I know not how, he standeth upon this ground, as if he felt it to shake under him, by some fearfull earth quake. *We are not ignorant* (sayth he) *that many Protestant authours are most frequent in condemning the gesture of kneeling at the receiving of the holy communion.* It is well he confesseth this: For he hath spared us some paines in repeating their frequent sentences of condemnation. But how dare he alledge their authority then for confutation of us that agree with them in condemning of the same gesture? *Many* (sayth he) *because they condemne it onely as used idolatrously by Papists: but not as it may be used religiously by orthodoxe and godly professors.* This is manifestly false; for though forraine Divines were never willing to contend particularly with our Church about this and such like ceremonies, yet their iudgement about our practise, doth sufficiently appeare, both by the reasons which they bring where they treat of it, touching us to the quick, if we were sensible: and also by their practise, in that (together with the masse) they

they banished this masse-gesture out of the Churches which would by them be directed: and how farre they were from expecting opportunitie of bringing it in againe, that in divers Synods, especially of France, and the Low-countries, they haue provided against it. The same also is confirmed by the poore gleanings which this Defendant can make out of their writings for his purpose. *Calvin* (sayth he) *requireth outward reverence in the use of the sacraments*. And so doe we also both require and performe it, as he did at Geneva, without kneeling. *Iuel also sayth there is a reverence due unto the sacrament without adoration*. Why that is the very thing we stand and suffer for. *Zanchie affirmeth that the sacraments are to be used with reverence as the word*. That is our argument against kneeling, which can never be answered. Would not Doct. *Morton* and his fellow Bishops blame us, if we should say, that they doe not reverence the word, because they be not on their knees all the sermon time? And why will they deny us to reverence the sacrament, except we be on our knees in receiving it? *Beza counteth this gesture very dangerous, wisheth and prayeth heartily it might be removed: but yet doth not simply condemne it as idolatrous*. Let his wishes and prayers be accepted, let this dangerous ceremonie be removed, or (which is lesse) not urged, and we will not contend with any man about the abstracted nature of it. *Peter Martyr* let fall one sentence which soundeth to a toleration of this gesture in some case. And this is all that the Defendant can alledge out of Protestant Divines for countenancing of our Prelats enioyning and urging of kneeling, with suspensions, excommunications, fines, imprisonments, even to the utter undoing of many a faithfull minister, and a multitude of godly people. What should a man say to such unreasonable men? The Lord deliver us from them.

LECT. XXXIX.

WHen all other witnesses faile, *Bellarmino* is brought in excusing Protestants from suspition of adoration, *De Euch. l. 4. c. 29*. But 1. *Bellarmino* speaketh onely of the Protestants doctrine, not of every thing which is found in some of their practises. 2 That which is no adoration in *Bellarmines* iudgement, may be in truth adoration. But this confutation is not worth larger confuting.

SECT.

SECT. XL. XLI. XLII. XLIII.

THough all that hitherto hath been alledged by the Defendant be nothing worth, yet if in our owne practise any thing can be found which maketh for his purpose, we must of necessitie either leaue that practise, or yeeld him the cause.

The first part of our practise to this purpose produced, sect. 40. is, *our inward reverence of soule, which may and ought to be expressed by visible reverence in some one or other gesture of the body.*

As if this were the very question, whether visible reverence may be shewed by bodily gesture in the receiving of the sacrament or no? I haue now sundry times affirmed, that wee stand as much and more for true reverence, both inward and outward, in celebration of the sacrament, then the Prelates themselves.

All the question is, whether kneeling in the very act of receiving be that bodily reverence which is required, or no. Beside, inward reverence for the act of it, is exercised in the hearing of the word, even in the highest degree often times, without kneeling: and for the disposition of it remaineth, when other graces are expressed: and all dispositions which are required unto right receiving of the sacrament, cannot distinctly and solemnly be expressed at one and the same time, by outward gestures, except we should look up to heaven, downe to the earth, and upon the table, all together. We think best therefore to make the greatest expressions of our reverence, before we sit down at the table, and after we are risen: but at the table to effect no other guises then Christ and his Apostles haue taught us. Out of such conceits as this, all superstition hath crept into the sacrament. For expression of reverence, some would not touch the bread with their hands, or the cup either, but haue both bread and wine put into their mouthes. Some more agreeably to Courtly fashion (urged by the Defendant) where meat is taken with silver forkes, in stead of hands, devised a silver pipe to suck up the wine through: some would not haue bearded lay men taste of the wine at all: and many for meere reverence (as they say) will neither touch wine nor bread, abstaining altogether from the sacrament.

The second part of our practise urged sect. 41. is, *that we doe not separate from the congregations of England, as we ought, if kneeling were idolatrous.* Where 1. I would haue it marked, who are the authors of schisme & separatists, whether we, as the Defendant chargeth us, or himselfe, and his fellow Bishops? He teacheth here in plaine termes, that in what Church soever any

thing idolatrous is practised, that Church ought to be separated from. Now suppose that our Church be free from all idolatrous pollution, yet if any man esteeme any one thing practised in it, idolatrous, this Defendant hath given him a rule whereby he must needs be drawne to present separation, if he will beleue him. And how ordinary is it for some reliques of idolatry to be found in true Churches, even about the sacraments? how easie for evill minded men to bring in some such things under faire pretenses, where they were not in use? must all men presently separate therefore utterly from such Churches, with a renunciation and utter condemning of them? the Defendant sayth yea: we say no. Who are the authours and teachers of schisme? I think they that first make this proposition, where any idolatrous thing is used, there utter separation must be made: and then by their Canons enioyning unnecessarie things, which they know are of many good Christians esteemed, at the least idolatrous, adde the assumption: and so leaue nothing but the very conclusion to be made up, by actuall separation of those that are inclined thereto.

2 I answer, there is idolatrous practise by participation, which in Gods interpretation is called idolatry, 1. Cor. 10. 14. 18. 20. 21. though it be not full idolatry. *Abaz* his Altar, which he took the paterne of from Damascus, was of that kind, 2. King. 16. Now in this case we are to sepearate from the practise, but not altogether from the practisers.

Our third practise is (forsooth) that *We say grace before meat*, sect. 42. As if we refused to pray before and after the receiving of the sacrament.

Our last practise objected, sect. 43. is, that *We receive the sacrament with heads uncovered*. The reason is this, if uncovering of the head be good, kneeling cannot be evill: but every man of reason may consider, whether *Cornelius* his falling down before *Peter*, Act. 10. 25. 26. or *Iohns* falling downe before the Angell, Rev. 19. 10. & 22. 8. 9. were no more then uncovering of the head before them? or whether they should haue been reprov'd for uncovering their heads, as they were for falling downe? Neither may it be thought, but those religious men intended chiefly to worship God in the person of his messengers. The Bishops themselves would think much if men should not uncover their heads before them (their very servants the Cancellors, &c. make graue ministers stand bare before them) yet I hope they would not haue men kneel to them. The truth is, the uncovering of the head is a generall or common gesture of reverence

to be used with discretion in all religious exercises; but kneeling is proper unto adoration.

THUS (good sir) I haue at your request, set downe my animadversions briefly upon Dr. *Mortons* Defence. I haue not taken such leasure in the doing of it, as it may be you expected; yet I doubt not, but upon the perusall of what is sayd of both parts (for I would not haue you read my reply without comparing of his defence) you will wonder how either Doctor *Morton*, whose workes were wont to praise him in the gates, as D. *Playfer* sayd of him when he disputed for his degree, should ever set forth so sleight a booke, or how with others it could find the applause that hath (as I heare) been given unto it. Surely when I enter into that consideration, these thoughts come to my minde; It may be he was growen too confident upon the good successe which he had in disputing against manifest corruptions of Poperie: and so thought he should preuaile also in excusing of some that are lesse palpable: and that so much the rather, because he had made so good a profession against the other; forgetting that of the Apostle, *We cannot doe any thing against the truth, but for the truth*, 2. Cor. 13. 8. It may be (which appeareth too plainly in many passages of his book) hee thought too meanly of the ministers learning whom he calleth Non-conformists, as knowing that they may not be suffered to perfect their studies in the universities, nor haue so much peace in the countrey as to make supply of that defect, but must alwayes fight with one hand at least against povertie and vexation, if with the other they fight against ignorance, and clime unto ripper knowledge: so that he had no great expectation of any reply, not remembring that *God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weake things to confound the mightie*, 1. Cor. 1. 27. It is possible also, that the birthes which come from him, being Bishop, whereof this is the first, will differ much from those which were in former time the children of his strength. Howsoever it is, I would not haue any thing which hath passed from me, turned to the preiudice of his person; but according unto my intent, applied only to his Defence, and the cause he defendeth.

PSALM. 119. 133.

I hate all vain intentions: but thy law doe I love.

IN JAHN
An exhortation to Doctor Morton.

MR. Dr. Morton, the Authour of this Reply, at my entreaty, I thank him, hath done as a *Doctor*, in manifesting that truth of God which you haue sought to darken; for which his paines, many of good judgement, and well affected in our land, blessed God. Now I, to whom the publishing of this Treatise is committed, doe also earnestly intreat you, to take in good part a word or two of exhortation from me as a *Pistor*, in applying that which is soundly taught, according to Gods word, to the conscience. I therefore exhort you to see and acknowledge your errour in taking upon you the defence of this bad cause; strive not against that light of truth, which this Reply manifesteth to you. Think with your selfe, that one, who is no professed Doctor in the Schooles, may teach you some truth. Consider that many of your coate haue lost the good gifts which they had, ere they became English Bishops, usurping authority and Lordship over Gods heritage. O take heed of abusing your good gifts and Schollership, lest the like curse befall you, which God hath brought upon others before your eyes for this sin: Why take you not where you left, in confuting the Papists, ere you were a Bishop? Are you so soon weary of well doing? Are you, a professed Doctor of Divinity, so foolish, that after you haue begun in the Spirit, you would be made perfect by the flesh of outward Ceremonies? Why doe you giue the obstinate and wilfull Papists such cause to rejoyce in your flesh? Ask your own conscience, whether those Ministers whom you oppugne, and stile Non conformists, be not of the godliest, and diligentest, and ablest Preachers that were to be found in the Diocesse of *Thomas Chester*? Should not the Bishop of the Diocesse favour such, procure the credit of such, encourage such in well doing? Should he not being stronger in faith (as he would be held to be, in judging the Ceremonies in question indifferent) then his godly but weak sonns, (vweak in his sense) who judge they should sinne if they should use them: For they haue no faith vvhere God hath no vvord to ground it on, as to hold it indifferent to Lord it over their brethren, vvhom Christ makes their equals; to thrust Pastors on Congregations, vvithout their choice and liking, to ordain & excommunicate Ministers, and others, by their sole power &c. should not he (I say) as a father, bear the infirmities of the weak? May he please himself, & his sonnes adversaries, the Idolatrous Papists, who increase in

number and insolencie in this land of late? May he, by an offensive book, disgrace his own sonnes, by coyning subtile and vaine distinctions to dazle the eyes of the simple? Makes he not the obstinate Papists to laugh in their sleeves, while they see him, who the other day vvas vehement against them in his Printed bookes, now pleading their cause, and using their Arguments to oppresse and disgrace his fellow ministers? Mr. Doctor, stand not upon an idle title of *Lord* given you (but ill-beseeming a Minister of Christ) by a mortall man, thereby to overcrow them, to vvhom the Lord of Lords hath given equall power and authority vvith your selfe. Consider, I pray you, vvwhether this be a fit time for you to print Bookes in defence of Popish trash? Consider, that the Reformed Churches about us can easily judge that this Ministry of the English Bishops, by vvriting so offensive bookes to maintaine mens devices in Gods vvorship, is a ready vvay to bring in Popery againe. Take heed how you blame such zealous Preachers as cannot conforme in every point to your judgement and practise, as the cause of the increase of Papists. Mark vvell vvwhether strangers vvho look on, vvill not judge the English Bishops friends of Antichrist in this, rather then Ministers of Christ, if they silence, deprive, suspend and excommunicate their fellow-Ministers, because they cannot subscribe to use these nocent ceremonies, the reliicks and taile of that vvhore of Babylon? O that you had spent those houres, vvherin this untimely, and mishapen last birth of yours vvvas unhappily conceived in your braine, in drawing an earnest and humble supplication to his Royall Majestie, for the removing of these Make bates, vvwhich haue done great harm in our Church, and never can doe good: for the deposing of all dumb Ministers, and vile Non-residents: for the enacting or executing of good lawes enacted against the Papists. I vvish that you may be sorie that you omitted this good, and did that evill. I pray you yet, ere it be too late, penne this supplication in the behalfe of our Church, and intreat your Gracious Lord, vvhom his Majesty greatly favoureth, to open his mouth for the good and salvation of many soules ready to be famished (under these dry nourtes, both idle and idoll shepheards) and in extreme danger to be seduced by Popish Seminaries. You intreated him to patronage your book, doe no lesse for the preferring of this needfull request. I hope a good vvord, spoken in good earnest, by that your Bountifull Lord, might be able to banish all godlesse Non-residents from the Court, and all Iesuits and Popish Priests out of the land. I beseech you seek Gods
honour

An exhortation to Doctor Morton.

honour in thus doing, and it vwill be Dr. *Mortons*, and his good Lords honour, vvho hereby shall manifest himselfe to be vvell affected to the truth vvich vve professe, and the good of our Church. I pray you consider how Papists be increased, since his Majestie first granted this full liberty to the Bishops, vvich Queen *Elizabeth*, of good memory, vvould not grant, to silence so many painfull preachers: And how many soules might haue been converted, and comforted by their meanes in almost 20 yeares space? Because I haue this conceit of Dr. *Morton*, that he is grieved and ashamed, that this hard dealing of the Bishops of England should further the kingdom of the Roman Antichrist, of whom he hath formerly shewed himselfe a professed enemy, therefore am I further earnest vvith him, that vvhen he shall be called to preach at the Court, before his Majesty, he vvill not seek great things for himselfe, but good things for the Church of God. Tell his Majesty plainly, I beseech you, how many dumb Ministers be in your Diocese, vvho cannot preach; tell him how many be non-resident, and haue many Benefices farre distant each from other. Complain of that cursed Court of Faculties: Tell him how many Papists be under your nose about Ecclesshall, in Staffordshire, and in your whole Diocese, that he may, by proportion, gather how many be in the Land. This I exhort you the rather to doe, because I feare his Majestie knoweth not how few faithfull Preachers be in the land: and how many idle drones swarm in each Diocese. I come seldome at the Court, but I heare that his Majestie useth to swear often: if this be so, haue mercy on his soule, beseech his Majestie to leaue it, charge him in the name of God to leaue it. There is strict order taken that no Minister, who conformes not, may preach at the Court. If such might preach there, though it cost them dear, they would deal plainly, tendring the salvation of the Kings soule, and the Courtiers. The Kings Phisicians will not stick to prescribe a bitter pill for his Majesties health, though it distaste him, and they doe well. Doe you the office of a spirituall Doctor, and the King will honour you; at least the King of Kings will reward your faithfull service. His Majestie knoweth well what is your duty, and what to judge of smoothing flatterers, *Hos. 7. 5*, namely, that they seek themselves, and not the salvation of mens soules. I hear there is great profanenesse in the Court, and if it be so, it will flow from the Court into the Countrey, therefore lift up your voice as a Trumpet. If there be any intent that the Prince should marry an idolatrous wife, see that according to your profound knowledge, you minister Gods word

An exhortation to Doctor Morton.

word sincerely. Speak the truth. I tell you as my friend, what I judg I ought to doe if I were in your place. I had rather beg my bread, then be a Minister in the Kings Court, upon condition that I should see abominable finnes committed by the highest powers, and I must preach Gods vvord to them, but not speak against their transgressions. What should it profite me to win the vvhole vvorld and loose my own soule? Cursed be that preferment which brings Gods curse on a mans soule. Mr. Doctor Morton, I speak this to you in Gods presence, wishing your good, I should be verie sorie if you should not make good use of it, because it would be a testimonie against you at the last day, whereas my prayer to God is, that it may serue to further your account at that day. The Lord our God, for his Christs sake, giue us holy and heavenly wisdom in all things, to his glory, the good of his Church, and the eternall salvation of our soules, Amen.

Thou shalt pollute the coverings of the Images of silver, and the rich ornament of thine images of gold, and cast them away as a menstruons cloth, and thou shalt say unto it, get thee hence, Isa. 30.22,

FINIS.

